The Roman Church and papal authority, AD 476-c.600

The Roman Church and Papal Authority, AD 476-c.600

Peter Francis Harrington

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Birkbeck, University of London

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines two sixth-century texts, the first edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana*, and it analyses forms and patterns of patronage before and after 476 to explain how the Roman Church was transformed and how expressions of authority were formulated between 476 and c.600. It identifies the demise of the line of western Roman emperors in 476 and imperial challenges to the Roman Church's claim to define doctrine, starting in 482, as catalysts for institutional change. The Church developed a number of strategies to manage its position in the changed environment, including the compilation of the two texts. The thesis differs from existing research in that it focuses on the Roman Church as an institution and calls on insights of neo-institutional theory; further, it interprets the *Collectio Avellana* as a late antique letter collection.

The thesis shows that after 476 different components of papal authority of came to the fore. It shows that the editors of the *Liber Pontificalis* promoted the authority of the bishop of Rome on the condition that he exercised it with the consent of the clergy. It demonstrates that the *Collectio Avellana*, considered to date to lack a defining purpose, had three: to defend the record of Pope Vigilius (537-55); to track and assert new expressions of papal authority; to opine on Church-Empire relations. Both texts reveal the importance of the Church's record of orthodoxy and doctrinal primacy to its identity, and the compilers' attempts to delineate its relationship with secular rulers. The analysis of patronage demonstrates that the institution gained in coherence as the bishop of Rome became its main donor, and that, from an early stage, popes established its boundaries, and that they extended the patronal offering by sponsoring new saints' cults.

TABLE OF CONTENTS **Page Number**

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

At the settlement of the Acacian schism in 519, Pope Hormisdas and the emperor Justin sought to articulate the basis on which they were reaching an accord. The schism had resulted from the emperor Zeno's challenge to Church of Rome's claim to define doctrine exclusively, when he issued the *Henotikon* in 482. To settle or heal the schism eastern prelates had to sign a *libellus*, acknowledging that the Roman Church had always preserved the Catholic religion unblemished and promising to follow its decisions in all matters. Further, they had to remove the names of some of the Church's opponents from diptychs. This appears to have been an acceptance of the Roman Church's primacy on doctrine. The position was reversed in 553-54 when Pope Vigilius (537-555), much against his will, accepted the condemnation of the Three Chapters, which the emperor Justinian had engineered at the Second Council of Constantinople (553). The apparent successful assertion of doctrinal primacy, followed by a major failure, fits with within the narrative which sees the period 476-536 as one of independence that gave way to one of precipitous decline and the 'gathering gloom of Byzantine tyranny over the Church'.[1] These two significant moments in the history of the Church in the sixth century do not feature in the other, more current, narrative which since the 1970s has sought to explain the rise of the Roman Church to a position of dominance in Rome.

This thesis presents a different perspective to both narratives. It focuses on the Roman Church as an institution in ways that exponents of neo-institutional theory would recognise. While much that is written about the Roman Church touches on it as an institution, very little concerns it qua institution. Against the first narrative, it shows that rather than 'rise and fall', there was continuity and some creativity in the ways that the Church expressed its authority. It calls for a very different understanding of papal authority in this period. The study addresses different research questions to the second narrative but it uses the same sources as historians in that field, and calls into question the degree to which some scholars emphasise the Church's and popes' adoption of imperial models of authority.

The thesis examines how the Roman Church was transformed as an institution in the period 476-c.600; how expressions of papal authority evolved over the same timeframe; and what, if any, was the interaction between these two developments. I argue that these developments need to be understood in the context of two major challenges that the Church faced at the onset of the period. In 476, with the demise of the line of western emperors, it lost its main patrons and

[1] Summarised by K. Sessa, 'The Roman Church and its Bishops' in J.J. Arnold, M.S. Bjornlie and K. Sessa (eds.), *A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy* (Leiden, 2016), p. 425.

the main supporters of its leadership over other churches. With the loss of the western emperors and their families as patrons, the Church also lost much of the support system that went with being intimately connected with empire. The Arian kings, Odoacer (476-93) and Theoderic (493-536), who ruled Central and Northern Italy on behalf of the eastern emperors, did not patronise the Roman Church to any meaningful extent. Nor were aristocrats significant patrons of the Church after 476. After Justinian reconquered the territory (536-54), neither he, nor his successors, became patrons in the way that their predecessors had been. In responding to the changing situations and environment, the Church had to develop new strategies. In charting the strategies employed over the decades, this thesis shows that popes emerged as the main patrons, attaining a new position, that they introduced a new form of patronage in saints' cults, and that a new internal financing arrangement helped to unify the Roman Church as an institution.

The second challenge has already been mentioned: Zeno's *Henotikon*, the first of several imperial measures in the period that challenged the bishop of Rome's claimed prerogative to define orthodox doctrine. Zeno issued the *Henotikon* after the Roman Church had started to assert its leadership on matters of doctrine, and had achieved a notable success when the Council of Chalcedon (451) accepted Pope Leo I's Tome, which defined the person and nature of Christ. The *Henotikon* was a statement of beliefs which sought to reconcile the positions of the supporters and the opponents of the Council of Chalcedon. It made no reference to Leo and Chalcedon and precipitated the Acacian schism, named after Archbishop Acacius of Constantinople, who had drafted the statement and was the leading prelate excommunicated. The schism was a major rupture between the Church of Rome and the patriarchal sees in the East. In issuing the *Henotikon*, Zeno was responding to the complex political, religious and ecclesiastical situation in the East, particularly the refusal of Miaphysites, who were based in strategic provinces, to accept the Chalcedonian definition of Christ's nature. As mentioned, the Acacian schism was settled in 519 on terms favourable to the Roman Church. However, the objections of miaphysites to Chalcedon did not go away. Justinian, first as adviser to his uncle, Justin, then as emperor (527-65), sought the Roman Church's acceptance of the theopaschite formula (campaigning between 519 and 534), and subsequently its condemnation of the Three Chapters (campaigning 532-53) in order to keep the miaphysites on board.[2] Pope John II was to accept the formula in 534; Pope Vigilius finally condemned the Three Chapters in 554, after

[2] An additional example of this challenge was Justinian's edict against Origen's teaching and works in 543. The issue surfaced in Palestine and attracted Justinian's attention and was to be condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 533, but not in its ecumenical sessions. It only affected monks in Palestine and did not have the 'world-wide echo' that the Three Chapters had. I omit this from consideration in the thesis as it is not mentioned in the examined sources. See A. Grillmeier with T. Hainthaler, *Christ in the Christian Tradition*: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604: The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, trans. by P. Allen and J. Cawte, vol. 2.2 (London, 1995), pp. 385-410.

they had been formally condemned by the Second Council of Constantinople in 553. Although acceptance of the formula was a defeat for the Church, it appears to have created few ripples outside Rome. However, condemnation of the Three Chapters caused a major reaction in the West: a council of the North African Church excommunicated Vigilius, the churches of Milan and Aquileia separated from communion with Rome, the latter remaining in schism until 698. The thesis tracks how the Church responded to these manifestations of the challenge on doctrine, and it shows that the Church and its supporters sought to shore up its claim to doctrinal primacy and that a new claim to jurisdictional primacy emerged during the Acacian schism.

Sources

I examine the transformation of the institution and development in expressions of papal authority primarily through analyses of two major texts, written or compiled by members of the Roman Church, and through the prism of patronage. The first edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana* are key documents for a period which, other than the pontificate of Gregory I and arguably that of Gelasius I, is not otherwise well provided with extant sources on the Roman Church. The first edition of the *Liber* comprises serial biographies of popes from the apostle Peter though to John II (533-35).[3] The *Collectio* is a collation of some 244 letters and other documents which date from 367 to 553, and were mostly written by or to popes, but the authors also include emperors, magistrates, bishops, priests and synods.[4] Both texts were compiled in the period: the *Liber* in c.536, the *Collectio* probably sometime between 553 and 560. I consider that they inform on the periods 476-536 and 476-c.585 respectively.[5] Both texts have historical material, accounts of pontificates before 476 or letters written before that date, which, I consider, the authors or compilers included to provide parallels with the later period, or to support an argument or position they wished to make. Both texts were comprehensively edited in the late nineteenth century, the *Liber* by Louis Duchesne (1886-92), the *Collectio* by Otto Günther (1895-98). The *Liber* has received considerable attention from scholars, including a recent important structural analysis of the first recension by Herman Geertman, which I utilise. Until recently, the *Collectio* has attracted far less scholarly interest, probably discouraged by Günther's authoritative assessment that its purpose was to collate letters not

[3] *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, *Le* Liber Pontificalis: *Texte, introduction et commentaire*, 2 vols (Paris, 1886-92). English translation by R. Davis, *The Book of the Pontiffs* (Liber Pontificalis): *The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Bishops to AD 715,* Translated Texts for Historians no. 6, 3rd edn. (Liverpool, 2010).
[4] *Collectio Avellana*, O. Günther (ed.), *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab a.CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collection,* Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, no. 35 (Vienna 1895-98).
[5] In Chapter 3 I argue that the *Collectio Avellana* also provides information for the years 560-85, the period during which the text may have been actively used.

recorded elsewhere. Recent interest includes a University of Perugia project which seeks to place the *Collectio* as a sixth-century canonical collection.[6]

Patronage of the Roman Church also provided clues about its development as an institution between 476 and c.600. As the analysis is based on a comparison of patrons and patterns of giving before and after 476, it also covers the period 312-476. I have drawn the data from a variety of sources, each of which is incomplete: textual, archaeological, artistic and epigraphic. The *Liber Pontificalis* is the major textual source for patronage, even if it is a recognisably partial one; other texts are the reports of Roman synods held in 499 and 595, whose subscriptions of attendees reveal the existence of *tituli* (parish churches), and, in several cases, are the only extant record of the church. For archaeological evidence, I rely heavily on the five-volume *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae* which, even if dated, remains a fundamental source for church building in Rome.[7] I additionally look at fourth- and early fifth-century elite Roman sarcophagi and several fifth- and sixth-century church mosaics. For inscriptions I mainly use Giovanni Battista de Rossi's *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae*, the ten-volume new series of the same title edited by Angelo Silvagni and others, and occasionally Ernst Diehl's *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*.[8] Inscriptions furnish some information on acts of patronage as well showing the importance of certain basilicas and cemeteries as burial locations of patrons. Through the analysis of this evidence I also identify elements in the transformation of the Roman Church.

The Institution of The Roman Church

For the purpose of this study I define the Roman Church as the institution that was structured or evolved to fulfil the pastoral and liturgical responsibilities of the bishop of Rome in the city, and which was able to support his claims to a wider authority in the Christian Church. Notwithstanding the pope's different roles, I consider that there was an identifiable core institution and that, as I suggest in Chapter 2, this definition reflects how the authors of the *Liber Pontificalis* perceived the Roman Church. Its main personnel, apart from the bishop, comprised priests of the *tituli*, deacons and sub-deacons based in the regions of the city, and

[6] R. Lizzi Testa, opening speech, 'Il Progetto umbro e i recenti studi sulla *Collectio Avellana'*, University of Perugia conference on '*La* Collectio Avellana *e le altre Collezioni canoniche di ambiente italico: formazione, contenuti e contesti'*, September 2016 (no longer available on the internet). Lizzi Testa points to the need to compare the *Collectio* with contemporary canonical collections. See also, Lizzi Testa, 'La *Collectio Avellana* e le collezioni canoniche romane e italiche del V-VI secolo: un Progetto di recerca', *Cristianesimo nella storia*, 35 (1) (2014), pp. 77-107.

[7] R. Krautheimer et al., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae, The Early Christian Basilicas of Rome (IV to IX Centuries)*, Monumenti di antichità cristiana Series 2, no. 2, 5 vols. (Rome, 1937-77)

[8] G.B. de Rossi (ed.), *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores* Vols. I-II.1 (1857-88); A. Silvagni, A Ferrua and D. Mazzolini (eds.), *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores nova series*, 10 vols. (Rome, 1922-85); E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, (Bonn, 1912).

notaries and *defensores ecclesiae* based at the Lateran *episcopium*. What may be considered the Church's buildings included the major Constantinian and other imperial basilicas (St Peter's, St Paul's, St Laurence's, the Basilica Constantiniana, S. Stephani in celio monte and others) over which it had practical and liturgical control, important papal basilicas such as Julii and S. Mariae, the twenty-five or so *tituli* (parish churches), cemeterial basilicas, cemeteries and basilical monasteries (those which served and supported the major basilicas).[9] I exclude from consideration any organisational aspects of the bishop's role as metropolitan of suburbicarian Italy and his responsibility for papal patrimonies, except in so far as they have a bearing on his position in Rome. I consider that extending the definition beyond this would blur the boundaries of the institution and confuse the analysis.

I refer to the institution as 'the Church of Rome', rather than as 'the Papacy'. John Moorhead declines to use the term 'papacy' as it implies a more developed institution than existed in Late Antiquity.[10] I consider that the Church was highly developed but it was not as yet sufficiently centred on the person and the authority of the pope to warrant this characterisation. Also, as I show, the Roman Church included clergy who thought about its strategic direction, supported the bishop and negotiated with him for a share of its wealth. The focus of this study is on the entire Church, as defined, and how its developments interacted with and affected expressions of its bishop's authority. However, I use the terms pope and bishop of Rome interchangeably. In addition, I treat the 'clergy' as a broad category, comprising all ordained members of the Roman Church, including *sacerdotes*, other than the pope.[11]

Papal Authority

The authority of the bishop of Rome in the fifth century was complex, having, I suggest, five main components: biblical mandates or claims; other traditional elements which attributed authority to the successor of Peter; acquired authority; secular legislative and ecclesial conciliar measures; and isomorphic aspects which added another strand of legitimacy. The biblical sources of authority are well known. As reported by Matthew, Jesus Christ mandated Peter to be head of the Church: 'You are Peter, and on this rock, I will build my Church, and the gates of the underworld can never hold out against it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven: whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven; whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven' (Matthew 16:18-19). John recorded the mandate in pastoral terms: 'Feed my lambs… Feed my sheep' (John 21:15-17). Popes also claimed responsibility for the 'care of

[9] In this thesis I use the Latin names for churches except for St Peter's, St Paul's and St Laurence's for which there is widespread common English usage. I use 'Basilica Constantiniana' when referring to the church built by Constantine at the Lateran as the more familiar term can be understood as the palace or the centre of the papal administration.
[10] J. Moorhead, *The Popes and the Church of Rome in Late Antiquity* (London, 2015), p. xii.
[11] The *Liber Pontificalis* sometimes distinguishes between the *sacerdotes* and the clergy. See the Life of Boniface II, *LP* 57.

all churches' (*sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*) (2 Corinthians 11:28). Although this latter claim derives from the apostle Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, in which he refers to 'the burden I carry every day, my anxious care for all the churches', it became an all-embracing claim by popes.[12] The biblical mandates, especially Matthew 16:18-19, constituted the core of the Roman Church's claim to primacy, the right of the bishop to be head of all Christian Churches and/or to be the final arbiter of orthodox doctrine. Successive popes were beginning to make claims which were recognisably primatial from the late fourth century onwards; for the most part these claims were asserted in the West and largely ignored in the East.

A second component of authority was two characteristics attributed to the Church by other parties which, while falling short of a recognition of primacy, nevertheless gave the bishop of Rome a special position: the Roman Church was apostolic and it was widely accepted as the centre of the Christian communion (*communio*). Churches founded by apostles acquired a special status: at the end of the second century Irenaeus of Lyons (c.130-c.200) and Tertullian of Carthage (c.160-c.220), in response to Gnostics' interpretations of scripture, promoted the idea that the bishops of sees founded by apostles were recipients and the guarantors of the oral tradition of Christ's preaching.[13] Within this tradition Irenaeus, but not Tertullian, attributed a special place to Rome which had been founded by two apostles: 'the church that is the greatest, the most ancient, and known to all, founded and set up by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul at Rome, while showing the tradition and the faith it proclaims to men comes down through the succession of the bishops even to us … For it is necessary for every church — that is, believers from everywhere — to agree with this church, in which the tradition from the apostles has always been preserved by those who are from everywhere, because of its more excellent origin (*potentiorem principalitatem*)'.[14] This passage has long been recognised as a

[12] Pope Zosimus made an early assertion of this claim in a letter to Aurelius and a Carthaginian Synod in 418, *Collectio Avellana, Ep.* 50.2: 'habet enim ille cum omnium ecclesiarum tum huius maxime, ubi sederat, curam'.

[13] J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th edn. (London, 1977), pp. 36-41. In response to the challenge from Gnostic sects, Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses*, III.1. *Patrologia Graeca* 7, col. 848) promoted the notion of an oral tradition of Christ's teaching which was passed on by apostles to their successors as bishops. Similarly, Tertullian in *De praescriptione haereticorum* (Chapter 21.32) considered that the apostolic tradition was not confined to the New Testament and the authenticity of doctrine lay in the fact that churches had been founded by, and had continued to be linked with, the apostles.

[14] Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, III.3.2, *PG* 7, cols. 848-49: 'Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximae et antiquissimae et omnibus cognitae, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae Ecclesiae, eam quam habet ad apostolis Traditionem, at annuntiatam hominibus fidem, per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes confundimus omnes eos, qui quoque modo, vel per sibi placentia, vel vanam gloriam, vel per caecitatem et malam sententiam, praeterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sent conservata est quae ea quae est ab apostolis Traditio'. Translation by R.M. Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyon*, The Early Church Fathers (London, 1997), pp. 124-25. R.B. Eno, *The Rise of the Papacy* (Wilmington, 1990), p.53, observes that Tertullian had little to say about the position of the Roman Church.

difficult text. Jalland suggested that by 'necessary … to agree' Irenaeus intended Rome to be understood as a paradigm example among apostolic churches who shared the same tradition, and therefore the latter 'necessarily agreed'.[15] This interpretation does not infer that Irenaeus expected the other churches to obey Rome. Nevertheless, I suggest that the statement is important in showing recognition from outside the Church that it had a special authority.

I consider that this willingness to attribute authority to Rome was also reflected in the recognition of the Roman Church as the centre of the Christian communion (*communio*). Ludwig Hertling has argued that that there are sufficient examples to show that other churches accepted the Roman Church in the role and that the basic function of its bishop was 'not the performance of official actions, but simply being present as the fundamental point of orientation and unity in the network of communion between several churches'.[16] An overriding characteristic of Christian Church was the desire of all churches to be in communion with one another, and in a single communion.[17] Klaus Schatz, who endorses Hertling's thesis, suggests that the Christian Church learned through the experience of schisms that it needed a centre of unity.[18] From no later than the third century, *communio* with the Church of Rome was decisive for membership of the Christian Church.[19] In 381 a council of Aquileia wrote to the emperor Gratian referring to the Roman Church 'from [which] the rights of the revered communion flow into all'.[20] Hertling attributed the selection of the Roman Church as the centre of the *communio* to the city's civil and imperial status and the bishop's succession from Peter.[21] The notion of the pope as the centre of the *communio* may not have had strong traction in the East before 476; for instance, when John Chrysostom needed help in 404 he appealed to the bishops of Milan and Aquileia as well as Pope Innocent I.[22] However, I consider Hertling's argument to be an important contribution as it points to a source of authority that had existed, and could exist, outside the structural arrangements of empire. The role should be considered with apostolic status as forms of authority which derived their substance and legitimacy in large part from what others, who were outside Rome, attributed to the position.

---

[15] T. G. Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy: A Historical Study*, Bampton Lectures at Oxford 1942 (London, 1944), pp. 109-15. K. Schatz, *Papal Primacy* (Collegeville, 1996), pp. 9-11, also points to difficulties with the text.

[16] L. Hertling, Communio*: The Church and the Papacy in Early Christianity*, trans. J. Wicks, (Chicago, 1972), pp. 10, 71-76; Schatz, *Papal Primacy*, pp. 18-28.

[17] Hertling, Communio, p. 69.

[18] Schatz, *Papal Primacy*, p. 37.

[19] Hertling, Communio, p. 69.

[20] 'Inde … in omnes venerandae communionis iura dimanant'. Council of Aquileia (381) to the emperors Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius in Ambrose, *Epistolae Prima Classis, Ep.* 11, *Patrologia Latina* 16, cols. 944-47, but especially 946, para 54; mentioned by Eno, *The Rise of the Papacy*, pp. 82-83.

[21] Hertling, Communio, pp. 65-66.

[22] H. Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great*, Oxford History of the Christian Church (Oxford, 2001), p.497.

The Church and the popes also acquired authority by asserting forms of leadership in the early centuries. We probably know of these exercises in leadership as they were largely successful, but they were not always unchallenged. At the end of the first century, the Roman Church intervened in the affairs of the church of Corinth where there had been a challenge to the local leadership: a letter sent in its name recommended that the new pastors stand down, advice that was followed.[23] A passage from a letter of Bishop Dionysius of Corinth (c.170), recorded by Eusebius of Caesarea, noted that it was the custom of the Romans 'to send contributions to many churches in every city'.[24] Also, from the late second century the Church started to assert its positions on the date on which to celebrate Easter, and on the question whether those baptised by heretics needed to be re-baptised. Pope Victor (c.195) was credited with proposing regional synods to settle the question of Easter. Except for the province of Asia where the views of Polycrates prevailed, his opinion prevailed and there was no objection in principle to his leadership.[25] The Roman Church's approach in the third century to the treatment of sinners and heretical baptism was opposed by the theologian Tertullian and Cyprian of Carthage, among others, although its opinions eventually prevailed.[26] A later display of leadership was Pope Julius (337-52)'s support for Athanasius of Alexandria and other eastern exiles in their struggle against the emperor Constantius II, who had sought to revise the definition of Christ's nature that had been agreed at the Council of Nicea (325).[27]

In addition to these ecclesiastical components and leadership components, imperial legislation and conciliar decisions acted to endorse and further papal authority in three important areas, although each measure had a qualification or some limitation. First, in declaring Christianity to be the religion of the empire, Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius I stated the version to be followed was 'the religion which was delivered to the Romans by the divine apostle Peter, as it has been preserved by faithful tradition; and which is now professed by the Pontiff Damasus and by Peter, bishop of Alexandria'.[28] Although the inclusion of Alexandria might have implied equality with Rome, the requirement that it was religion delivered by Peter and the tradition, mentioned by Jerome, that Mark was the disciple and interpreter of Peter very likely neutralised that suggestion.[29] Second, canon 4 of the Council of Nicea (325), organised and controlled by Constantine, established the principle that the ecclesiastical organisation should match that of

[23] Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society,* pp. 59-61.
[24] Eusebius, *The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine,* trans. by G.A. Williamson. ed. by A. Louth (London, 1965/1989), p. 131.
[25] Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy*, p. 121.
[26] A. Siecienski, *The Papacy and the Orthodox: Sources and History of a Debate*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (Oxford, 2017), pp. 149-52.
[27] Eno, *The Rise of the Papacy,* p. 49.
[28] Edict *Cunctos populos* 380 (Codex Theodosius, XVI. i.2.) in H. Bettensen and C. Maunder (eds.), *Documents of the Christian Church*, 4th edn. (Oxford, 2011), p. 20.
[29] St Jerome, *On IIllustrious Men*, trans. T.P. Halton (Washington, 1999), VIII, p. 17.

the Empire.[30] This promoted the position of the Roman Church as long as Rome remained a residential imperial city. However, this principle of accommodation had an inherent weakness: imperial arrangements did not remain unchanged and Constantinople grew in importance. Under pressure, Rome countered with the principle of 'apostolicity', arguing for the greater importance of sees founded by apostles. The issue crystallised at the First Council of Constantinople (381) which reinforced the principle of accommodation and declared that the bishop of Constantinople was to have primacy of honour after the bishop of Rome because it was the New Rome'.[31] In the following year Pope Damasus organised a council in Rome which stated that the Roman Church had been placed before others, not by 'conciliar decrees' but by Christ's mandate to Peter in Matthew 16:18-19.[32] Instead of the simple principle of apostolicity, Damasus promoted an ordering of the major sees based on their association with Peter: Rome first, Alexandria (founded by Peter's disciple Mark) next, then Antioch (where Peter was first bishop).[33] The principle of accommodation helped embed the bishop of Rome's control over churches in the West but after 476 this was no longer underpinned by a western emperor's authority and, vis-à-vis Constantinople which became the sole imperial centre, the Roman Church had every reason to re-emphasise the principle of apostolicity.

Third, in 445 Valentinian III formally endorsed the jurisdictional authority of popes in the western empire. Although Leo I (440-61) had taken action against Hilary of Arles, who had exceeded his jurisdiction in deposing two bishops, he was not in a position to enforce the judgement in Gaul. In response to a petition (*relatio*) from Leo, Valentinian issued a *novella* to the *magister militum* Aetius, upholding the pope's assertions of primacy: 'we decree by this perpetual ordinance: that it should not be lawful for Gallican bishops, as well as those for other provinces to attempt anything contrary to the old custom without the authority of the venerable pope of the eternal city; but whatever the authority of the apostolic see has ordained, or shall have ordained, this should be the law for those persons and for all persons…'[34] Valentinian also made provision for governors to act if bishops failed to obey the pope. His *novella* was a strong endorsement of the papacy's jurisdictional primacy which also ensured that the state

[30] Canon 4 of Nicea stated that the metropolitan was to ratify ordinations of bishops in the province. See L.D Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils, (325-787),* Theology and Life Series, no. 21, (Collegeville, 1983), p. 64.
[31] Canon 3, The Council of Constantinople 381, in Betterson and Maunder, *Documents of the Christian Church*, p. 87; Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, pp. 64 and 127-28; D. Hunt, 'The Church as a Public Institution', in A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds.), *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 13, *The Late Empire AD 337-425*, p. 245 ff.
[32] The account of the Synod of Rome (382) is taken from *Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, ed. E. von Dobschutz, Texte et Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristilichen Literatur Vol 38.4 (Leipzig, 1912), p.7.
[33] Siecienski, *The Papacy and the Orthodox*, pp. 160-65;
[34] Valentinian III, *Novellae* 17 (*PL* 54, col. 637), trans. P.R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church: A Collection of Legal Documents to A.D. 535*, vol. 2, p. 734. See also, M. Humphries, 'Valentinian III and the City of Rome (425-55)' in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds.), *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 166-70.

would provide an enforcement arm. Its weakness or limitation was that it only applied in the western part of the empire.

A final component of papal authority comprised the adoption of imperial processes and behaviours, a phenomenon that institutional theorists classify as 'isomorphism'.[35] Two examples before 476 were decretals and church construction. Decretals were modelled on imperial rescripts although it took time for them to acquire the same force as the imperial version. Like rescripts, they were responses to questions posed to popes, usually on matters of organisation, discipline or liturgy. They increasingly used terms of command that appeared in rescripts: *praecipimus, decernimus, iubemus*. They had an ideological component in that, on occasion, the pope took the opportunity in the *arenga* to assert papal authority.[36] However, in the beginning the replies were opinions rather than decrees, even if they were opinions that the pope expected recipients to accept.[37] In time decretals acquired the full force of law, a development assisted by the emergence of collections, of which Dionysius Exiguus's early fifth-century *Collectio Decretorum Pontificum Romanorum* is a notable example, by popes' adherence to precedent and by the existence of an archive.[38] Another example of isomorphic authority was church construction. The construction of public buildings and monuments in Rome had been largely the preserve of emperors and the upper reaches of the senatorial aristocracy. Even if the scale was unequal, some historians, for example Bryan Ward-Perkins and Herman Geertman, argue strongly that popes' construction of churches engendered similar prestige and authority.[39]

Papal authority before 476 comprised this rich cocktail of elements. However, up to that date, expressions of authority were contained within the political realities and the structure of the Empire. It is difficult to dispute Geoffrey Dunn's assessment that that the real basis for the Roman bishop's authority over other bishops in this period was the hierarchy of the Roman provincial system which, of course, only supported the Roman Church's position in the West.[40] The underlying principle, or rather the means of enforcing it, would come to an end after 476. Any power from others' willingness to attribute authority or roles, such as the full implications

---

[35] See below, p. 23.
[36] D. Jasper and H. Fuhrmann, *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*, History of Medieval Canon Law (Washington, 2001), pp. 7-22.
[37] D. D'Avray provides a comprehensive view on the current scholarship in 'Half a Century of Research on the First Papal Decretals', *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law*, 34 (2017), pp. 331-374.
[38] G.D. Dunn, 'The emergence of Papal decretals: the evidence of Zosimus of Rome' in G. Greatrex, H. Elton and L. McMahon (eds.), *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2015), pp. 81-92.
[39] B. Ward-Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Urban Public Buildings in Northern and Central Italy AD 300-850* (Oxford, 1984), pp.71, 75, and 77; H. Geertman, 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis* romano. Un processo di organizzazione della memoria' in F. Bougard and M. Sot (eds.), *Liber, Gesta, histoire: Ecrire l'histoire des évêques et des papes, de l'Antiquité au XXIe siècle* (Turnhout, 2009), pp. 37-107.
[40] G.D. Dunn, 'Introduction', in Dunn (ed.), *The Bishop of Rome in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2015), p. 3.

of apostolic status or of the pope's role at the centre of the *communio*, remained largely latent until 476. Nevertheless, these powers existed and, I suggest, would come into play when the imperial structure failed. I consider that all five components of authority are relevant. However, in recent years, historians have tended to focus more on the secular or isomorphic aspects.

Historiography

The hundred or so years after the First Vatican Council (1870) witnessed considerable scholarly interest in the history of papal authority, 'primacy' and the papacy as an institution. The decades on either side of the Second Vatican Council (1962-65) saw the high watermark of this interest. Scholars sought to explain the 'rise of the papal monarchy', spawning teleological narratives in the process. Theologians sought to understand primacy: Protestants seeking to deconstruct the pope's claim to be the 'Head of all Churches', a major obstacle to re-unification; Catholics questioning the degree to which they needed to obey the pope's teaching on such matters as birth control or, in rare cases such as the Dominican Cornelius Ernst, wondering if their Church had taken a wrong path in allowing jurisdictional interpretations of primacy to predominate over theological or sacramental alternatives.[41] Since the 1970s, approaches have been influenced by a strong desire to counter the inherent teleology of the earlier period, and by secularism, a more general focus on the western episcopate as a field of study, and a greater use of archaeological evidence. These trends have resulted in a more limited interest in papal authority and primacy, a move to exploring the position of the bishop and the Church in the city of Rome, a greater emphasis on the secular or isomorphic components of the pope's authority and a renewed attempt to look at aspects of the papal administration.

Walter Ullmann exemplified an approach to papal authority that was teleological and juristic; he also explained the development of papal government in legal terms. He saw the origins of the medieval papacy in the pontificate of Leo I. He argued that Leo's use of the Roman Law concept '*indignus heres*', supported by the Letter of Clement to the apostle James, established each pope as the direct successor of Peter. This juristic succession and a jurisdictional interpretation of Matthew 16:18-19 provided the ideological foundation stone for the later papal monarchy. He also argued that a centralised form of government was inherent in the Petrine

[41] C. Ernst, 'The Primacy of Peter: Theology and Ideology', *New Blackfriars,* 50 (1969), pp. 347-355 and 399-404; R.A. Markus and E. John, *Papacy and Hierarchy* (London, 1969); Markus, 'Papal Primacy: Light from the Early Middle Ages', *The Month,* 229 (1970), pp. 352-61, reprinted in *From Augustine to Gregory the Great: History and Christianity in Late Antiquity* (London, 1983), no. 16; Sessa, 'Exceptionality and Invention: Silvester and the Late Antique "Papacy" at Rome' in J. Baun, A. Cameron, M. Edwards and M. Vincent (eds.), *Studia Patristica*, 46 (2010), Papers presented at the Fifteenth Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford in 2007, pp. 77-94.

mandate in Matthew 16.[42] His overwhelming emphasis on a juristic interpretation is apparent in the absence of any reference to doctrinal primacy in his analysis of this period; instead he posited a struggle for hegemony between the *sacerdotium* and the *regalis potestas.*[43] In addition, he considered that the Council of Chalcedon implicitly rejected papal primacy, even though it declared that 'Peter had spoken through Leo'; it clearly mattered more in his judgement that canons 17 and 28 of the Council endorsed the principle of accommodation both generally, and specifically in regard to the sees of Rome and Constantinople.[44] While historians now reject the teleological components of Ullmann's arguments, his legal analysis of the basis of papal succession remains influential, and his work continues to shape and/or maintain a predominantly juristic and jurisdictional perception of papal authority.

With two exceptions subsequent interpretations of primacy have not taken the understanding of primacy much beyond Ullman's analysis. While Joseph Canning urges some caution in accepting the full implications of Ullmann's interpretation of Leo's pontificate, he also observes that even the Johannine mandate ('Feed my lambs…'), which is clearly pastoral in its language, was given 'a legal interpretation as fulfilling the Matthean one'.[45] Philippe Blaudeau sees the critical power 'to bind and loose' (*ius [*sic*] ligandi solvendique*) in Matthew 16 as a disciplinary prerogative that found its form in the West in decretals.[46] However, importantly, he draws attention to Leo I (440-61)'s active policy of asserting Rome's primacy on doctrine in the East in the face of the miaphysite heresy. He identifies the Petrine status of the Roman see and its association with the apostle's preaching (*praedicatio*) as the underlying basis of the Church's authority in this sphere rather than Matthew 16.[47] George Demacopoulos has recently taken a new look at primacy by exploring the 'Petrine topos'. His approach is discourse analysis rather than institutional history and he chiefly argues that papal claims escalated at moments of weakness. However, this approach, which eschews pursuing 'the hopeless quest of recovering and interpreting every historical detail' does lead to questionable assessments of papal weakness and, as I discuss in Chapter 3, to a misunderstanding of the dynamics of papal power in this period.[48] Nevertheless, both Blaudeau and Demacopoulos add to the discussion

[42] W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: A Study in the Ideological Relation of Clerical to Lay Power*, 2nd edn. (London, 1962), pp.19-28; Ullmann, 'Leo I and the Theme of Papal Primacy', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 11 (1) (1960), pp.25-51.
[43] Ullmann only begins to talk about doctrinal primacy, which he calls 'magisterial primacy' when he discusses Charlemagne's arrangements with the Church. See *The Growth of Papal Government*, p. 109.
[44] W. Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London, 1972), p. 29.
[45] J. Canning, *A History of Medieval Political Thought, 300-1450* (London, 1996), pp. 30-32.
[46] P. Blaudeau, *Le Siège de Rome et L'Orient (448-536): Étude Géo-Ecclésiologique*, Collection de l'École française de Rome, no. 460 (Rome, 2012), p. 222.
[47] Blaudeau, *Le Siège de Rome*, pp. 199-210 and 211-12; also, Blaudeau, 'Rome contre Alexandrie? L'interprétation pontificale de l'enjeu monophysite (de l'émergence de la controverse eutychienne au schism acacien 448-484)', *Adamantius*, 12 (2006), pp.140-216.
[48] G.E. Demacopoulos, *The Invention of Peter: Apostolic Discourse and Papal Authority in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 2013), pp. 3-7. I particularly disagree with his assessment of Pope Gelasius's rehabilitation of Misenus, which I discuss in Chapter 3 — see below pp. 99 and 112.

on primacy, and I consider the former's spotlight on doctrinal primacy in the fifth century is an important contribution in so far as it represents a rare focus on the subject.

Since the 1970s, there has been a far greater focus on the emergence of the bishop of Rome into a position of authority in the city. Richard Krautheimer and Charles Petri anticipated this development, when they argued that the Church was dominant in the city in the fifth century.[49] Subsequent scholarship has rejected this assessment as teleological and more recent explanations fit within a broad narrative of power passing from western emperors, first to the senatorial aristocracy, and then to the bishop of Rome. This has resulted in a significant focus on the aristocracy's relationship with the Church, and for some historians, the Laurentian schism (498-506/7) and the start of the Gothic Wars (536) are key events. Peter Llewellyn focused on the struggle between senators and clerical hierarchy for control of the Church and its wealth, and how that conflict related to the split within the clergy in the Laurentian schism.[50] Participants in the Manchester University-based Religion, Dynasty and Patronage Project, challenged the teleology of Krautheimer and Pietri and developed Llewellyn's analysis.[51] Their model of interaction, as demonstrated by Kate Cooper, is of aristocrat-led coalitions of lay and clerical participants in competition with each other.[52] However, they see the Roman Church's replacement of the senatorial aristocracy as the main political actor in Rome as a by-product of Justinian's re-conquest rather than as an outcome of that political competition: the bishop of Rome 'emerged as the implausible winner of the Ostrogothic-Byzantine crisis'.[53] Michele Salzman argues that popes relied on aristocrats to manage their major external relationships, and while the aristocrats could have entered the Church, they chose not to do so until the Gothic Wars deprived them of their secular careers.[54] The first aristocratic popes were Vigilius (537-55), Pelagius I (556-61) and John III (561-74). Both Llewellyn and the Project participants portray a weaker papacy, and a more fragmented view of the Roman Church, than would support an argument that the Roman Church had strategic programmes or agendas, whereas Salzman implies that the narrative should be aristocrats' takeover of Church, which arguably the Gothic Wars triggered.

---

[49] C. Pietri, *Roma christiana: recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440)*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, no. 224 (Rome, 1976); R. Krautheimer, *Rome: Profile of a City, 312-1308* (Princeton, 1980/2000).
[50] P. Llewellyn, 'The Roman Church during the Laurentian Schism: Priests and Senators', *Church History,* 45 (1976), pp. 417-27.
[51] The project or collaboration started in 1996. See K. Cooper and J. Hillner, 'Introduction' in K. Cooper and J. Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900* (Cambridge, 2007), p.7.
[52] Cooper, 'The martyr, the *matrona* and the bishop: the matron Lucina and politics of the martyr cult in fifth- and sixth-century Rome', *Early Medieval Europe* 8 (1999), pp. 297-317 and Cooper and Hillner, 'Introduction', *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage,* p. 12.
[53] Cooper and Hillner (eds.), 'Introduction', *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage,* p.4.
[54] M.R. Salzman, 'Lay Aristocrats and Ecclesiastical Politics: A New View of the Papacy of Felix III (483-492 CE) and the Acacian Schism', *Journal of Early Christian Studies,* 27(3) (2019), pp. 465-89.

Claudia Rapp's observation that the approach of social and political historians working after the mid-twentieth century 'is marked by a noticeable neglect of the religious or even ecclesiastical dimension of the episcopate', has considerable validity for Rome.[55] Except for the pontificate of Gregory I (590-604), there have been few attempts to explain the ecclesiastical development of the Church in Rome.[56] Instead, some historians have identified secular structures or patterns of authority which, they argue, popes copied. An influential proponent of this trend is Andrea Augenti, who argues that the papacy established its legitimacy in Rome by gradually occupying the Palatine Hill, an area with enduring associations with power.[57] Kristina Sessa focuses on the institution of the bishop of Rome and argues that estate management ('*oikonomia*'), and in particular the position of steward, was the model for episcopal authority in Rome. In this major work she says nothing about Petrine authority.[58] Another contribution identifying an isomorphic pattern of authority is provided by those who align imperial and papal patronage, and argue that churches were a new form of public monuments, and that popes sought to acquire the kind of prestige that typically accrued to emperors from their construction.[59] Approaching the matter from a different perspective, Rosamond McKitterick argues that the purpose of the *Liber Pontificalis* was to construct the position of the pope as secular ruler of Rome, in support of which she argues that the structural model for the text was Roman imperial history.[60]

In addition, since the 1970s there has been little interest in writing an institutional history of the Roman Church although, more recently, historians have addressed aspects of its administration. Two decades ago, Thomas Noble observed that the source material is limited, the basic institutional structure is well known, and the remaining problems were not particularly interesting; where scholars engaged, they were usually informed by insights from social anthropology.[61] Noble has also noted that a discussion of the institutional development of the

---

[55] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: the Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition,* Transformation of the Classical Heritage, no. 37 (Berkeley, 2005), p. 9.

[56] Alan Thacker is an exception in showing how popes applied a strategic approach to saint cults by linking extra mural cult sites with centres of worship within the walls. See 'Martyr Cults Within the Walls: Saints and Relics in the Roman *Tituli* of the Fourth to Seventh Centuries' in A. Minns and J. Roberts (eds.), *Text, Image, Interpretation: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature and its Insular Context in Honour of Éamonn Ó Carragáin* (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 31-72.

[57] A. Augenti, 'Continuity and Discontinuity of a seat of power: the Palatine Hill from the fifth to tenth century' in J.M.H. Smith (ed.), *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 43-54, particularly pp. 49-52.

[58] K. Sessa, *The Formation of Papal Authority in Late Antique Italy* (Cambridge, 2012).

[59] For instance, Ward-Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, pp. 70-77, and C. Goodson, 'Roman Archaeology in Medieval Rome' in D. Caldwell and L. Caldwell (eds.), *Rome: Continuing Encounters Between Past and Present* (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 23–45.

[60] R. McKitterick, 'Roman Texts and Roman History in the early Middle Ages' in C. Bolgia, R. McKitterick and J. Osborne (eds) *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas, c.500-1400* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 19-34. I discuss McKitterick's views in more detail in Chapter 2.

[61] T.F.X. Noble, 'The Intellectual Culture of the Early Medieval Papacy' in *Rome nell'alto medioevo,* Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 48 (Spoleto, 2001), pp. 180-81.

papacy between Constantine (306-337) and Gregory I (590-604) is a missing essay in the oeuvre of Michele Maccarrone, 'the greatest papal historian of the twentieth century'.[62] Prior to Noble's observations, Jeffrey Richards saw the papacy as an institution with its ideology and objectives (primacy and the defence of orthodoxy) set by 476. Beyond stating that if it grew, it did so through a series of historical accidents rather than any coherent radical design, and by being 'the right institution in the right place at the right time', he showed no interest in its development qua institution in the period 476- 752.[63] John Moorhead's recent work on popes from 440 to 752 updates that of Richards. He is concerned to place popes in their community and occasionally looks at the internal workings of the church, but he does not analyse the Roman Church as an institution and, as noted above, he declines to use the term 'papacy' as this suggests a greater degree of institutionalisation than he considered had been achieved in late antiquity.[64] Other historians, who have sought to breathe new life into the subject, have focused on the development of the more limited phenomenon of papal administration. Bronwen Neil and Pauline Allen have applied the current business concept of 'crisis management' to the papacy between 410 and 590, and especially to the pontificate of Gelasius I (492-496), while Peter Brown discusses popes as 'managerial bishops'. [65] Caroline Humfress points to the Church's borrowings from the late Roman imperial government culture, essentially its legal mentality, as it started to issue decretals.[66] However, although these later works address aspects of the Church as an institution, they do not seriously challenge Noble's observations.

I present a different view of the Roman Church and papal authority. Against Ullmann and his followers' juristic interpretations, I question the dominant juristic perspective, and consider that more attention should be paid to doctrinal primacy, which spoke to the Church's identity and, in reality, was the stronger source of the Church's power and authority. I disagree with Demacopoulos's main characterisation of primacy: as I show in Chapter 3, popes engaged with eastern emperors, and with some success. I differ from those who present a narrative of popes succeeding senatorial aristocrats as the political leaders in Rome; I am more concerned to explain the Church's institutional development. For this, I consider what happened in 476 and 482 more important than the Laurentian schism and the Gothic Wars, and I suggest that the relationship between the bishop and his clergy was more critical than that between aristocrats

[62] T.F.X. Noble, 'Michele Maccarrone on the Medieval Papacy: Review Article', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 80(3) (1994), p. 519.
[63] J. Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476-752* (London, 1979), pp. 1-5.
[64] Moorhead, *The Popes and the Church of Rome*, p. xii.
[65] B. Neil and P. Allen, *Crisis Management in Late Antiquity (410-590 CE): A Survey of the Evidence from Episcopal Letters)* (Leiden, 2013) and *The Letters of Gelasius I (492-496): Pastor and Micro-Manager of the Church of Rome* (Turnhout, 2014); P. Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550 AD* (Princeton, 2012), Chapter 28 but especially pp. 496-98 and p. 492.
[66] C. Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 211-12; D'Avray, 'Half a Century of Research on the First Papal Decretals', p. 331.

and the Church. Unquestionably, there was a secular component to papal authority, but I argue that it should not be interpreted as laying any claim to secular rule in Rome. I am mindful of Noble's observations on institutional history and the role of social anthropology; I propose a new explanation of the Church's institutional development and I adopt insights from neo-institutional theory.

Neo-Institutional Theory

In this thesis I call on insights of institutional theorists, especially those of political scientists. Neo-institutional theory has developed since the 1970s as a semi-autonomous discipline with participation from political scientists, sociologists, economists and political philosophers.[67] I consider particularly relevant the contributions of political scientists who broadly belong within one of two schools, namely Historical Institutionalism and Rational Choice Theory, and who address institutional change, the behaviour of individuals and groups within an organisation, and concepts such as institutional legitimacy.[68] The approach of political scientists differs from that of historians and many findings are, on their own terms, not 'portable'. However, their approach can help frame how one might perceive an institution, and they can suggest what processes, structures and behaviours are worth consideration. In addition, their general findings can support conclusions drawn from difficult evidence.

Historical institutionalists seek to explain how institutions change.[69] While there are many definitions of 'institution' it is widely accepted that their overarching characteristics are stability and the ability to reproduce themselves. To the sociologist Anthony Giddens '[they] by definition are the more enduring features of social life … giving "solidity" [to social systems] across time and space'.[70] Inherently they are relatively resistant to change. Historical institutionalists focus on how they change. They consider that changes in environmental conditions can produce institutional change. They recognise that institutions are normally in 'equilibrium' but that equilibrium can be 'punctured', often by 'exogenous shocks' which are usually wars or economic crises. Following these occasions ('critical junctures') institutions can pursue a number of options, including a renegotiation of their elements or a re-direction to a new purpose. Unlike Rational Choice theorists, historical institutionalists identify longer-

[67] B.G. Peters, *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The New Institutionalism*, 4th edn. (Cheltenham, 2019), Chapters 1 and 2.
[68] R.C. Scott, *Institutions and Organisations: Ideas, Interests and Identities*, 4th edn. (Los Angeles, 2014), Chapter 2.
[69] P. Pierson, *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis* (Princeton, 2004). See Chapter 5 for details and critique.
[70] Quoted by Scott, *Institutions and Organisations*, p. 57.

term processes rather than the strategic moves of individuals ('actors') as causes or agents of change.[71]

Rational Choice theorists focus on individuals' actions and behaviours within an institution. They see institutions as entities established (or modified) by individuals to advance their own interests: '[institutions] represent deliberately constructed edifices established by individuals seeking to promote or protect their interests'.[72] Theorists expect actors to be active in pursuing their goals within existing structures. However, they also suggest that actors often come to realise that their goals can best be achieved through collective action.[73]

Theorists of all disciplines stress the importance of legitimacy and some discuss 'isomorphism' as a form of legitimation. Legitimacy is an important concept for any institution or organisation but, I suggest, particularly for one that seeks to establish a position of authority over others. The sociologist Talcott Parsons saw that legitimacy is acquired from the extent to which the organisation's goals match its function in society.[74] Isomorphism is a practice that accrues legitimation by copying existing authoritative structures or processes.[75] The sociologists John Meyer and Brian Rowan argue that organisations, a common form of institution, which exist in highly elaborate institutional environments and adopt structures that are authoritative in those settings, acquire legitimacy.[76]

These insights have a bearing on the subject matter of this thesis. I consider that the Roman Church's loss of its main patron and the main supporter of its primacy, and the emergence of the eastern emperor as a competitor in the religious sphere were double exogenous shocks to which it had to respond. There is a strong case for saying that the event of 476 did not bring about the end of the empire in the West but, in regard to the Roman Church as an institution, I consider that the near contemporary events of 476 and 482 had significant consequences.[77]

---

[71] Pierson, *Politics in Time*, pp. 134-35; J. Conran and K. Thelen, 'Institutional Change' in O. Fioretos, T.G. Falleti and A. Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (Oxford, 2016), pp. 51-70.
[72] Scott, *Institutions and Organisations*, p. 40.
[73] Peters, *Institutional Theory in Political Science*, p. 55.
[74] T. Parsons, 'A sociological approach to the theory of organisations' in Parsons, *Structure and Process in Modern Societies*, (Glencoe, 1960), p.21, mentioned in Scott, *Institutions and Organisations*, p. 184.
[75] Scott, *Institutions and Organisations*, pp. 183-85.
[76] J.W. Meyer and B. Rowan, 'Institutionalised Organisations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony' in *American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (1977), p. 352, mentioned in Scott, *Institutions and Organisations*, p. 184.
[77] M.S. Bjornlie, for instance, argues that 476 only marked the end of the western empire at the moment that it suited the propagandist purposes of the eastern court — see *Politics and Tradition between Rome, Ravenna and Constantinople: A Study of Cassiodorus and the* Variae*, 527-554*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, Fourth Series no. 89 (Cambridge, 2013), p. 93. R. McKitterick, 'The popes as rulers of Rome in the Aftermath of Empire, 476-69' in S.J. Brown, C. Methuen and A. Spicer (eds.), *The Church and Empire*, Studies in Church History, vol. 54 (Cambridge, 2018), pp. 72-73, also discusses the end of the western empire in 476 as a construct of Byzantine apologists and/or of nineteenth- and twentieth-century historians.

Rational Choice theorists' explanation of individual and group behaviour within an organisation goes some way to endorsing the analysis of the actions of the clergy that I present in regard to their support of episcopal authority and in paying for their positions. I suggest that some of the assertions of authority that we see after 476 were attempts to claim or re-establish a legitimacy that had been put in doubt when the Roman Church lost the support of western emperors. I include in this reaction attempts by the papal administration to model itself on the imperial bureaucracy.

Argument

This thesis sets out to consider how the Roman Church responded to the demise of the line of western emperors, and whether and/or how expressions of authority evolved in the changed environment. I argue that the events of 476 and 482 were profoundly determinative to the development of the Church as an institution and they gave rise to new expressions of papal authority. The findings of the study call for a reconsideration of how papal power and authority operated in the period. The events significantly altered the environment in which the Church operated. The Church no longer had close at hand an emperor willing to enforce its authority and it could not rely on the hierarchical provincial structure to maintain its position in the West. Instead, I argue, it had to revert to those components of its authority which had pre-existing broad acceptance: its enhanced apostolic status (it was founded by two apostles, one of whom was the prince of the apostles) and its position at the centre of the Christian communion. Although the bishop of Rome's role as the centre of the *communio* had limited traction in the East, it was to acquire additional force through the grafting on of a new interpretation of the power to bind and loose which emerged in the Acacian schism and established the bishop of Rome with effective power to determine membership of the Christian community. Instead of the current heavy adherence to juristic interpretations of papal authority, I argue that more attention needs to be paid to doctrinal primacy and the Church's efforts to maintain and enhance its record of and reputation for orthodoxy. This spoke to its identity as an institution and was a source of real power.

I argue that the replacement of the western emperor by the pope as the Church's main patron helped unify the institution, even if all the steps in the process cannot be fully understood; further, the analysis of papal patronage shows a focus on the bishop's pastoral responsibilities in the city. Ostrogothic kings and eastern emperors did not replace the western emperors as patrons. It did not serve senatorial aristocrats' interests to patronise the Roman Church, even if they built churches on their estates or in their localities. The behaviour of the clergy was of

greater importance. There are signs that the clergy negotiated with the bishop for a share in his authority and in the Church's wealth. The post-476 financial settlement (the *quadripartitum*) probably secured the clergy's engagement and altered patronal patterns. I suggest that the Church united under the pope as the clergy acquired a share in its wealth.

I also argue that more attention should be paid to the Roman Church as an ecclesiastical institution, rather than to its secular and isomorphic characteristics or, in one or two cases, to its future as the secular ruler in Rome. I do not consider that a focus on the Church as an institution limits the perspective of the range of its activities; rather, I consider it validly shows an organisation concerned with ecclesiastical matters.

The thesis is structured in three main chapters, focusing on the *Liber Pontificalis*, the *Collectio Avellana*, and patronage respectively. In Chapter 2, I show that the authors of the first recension of the *Liber Pontificalis* were intent on promoting the doctrinal primacy of the Roman Church but expressions of the clergy's interests are also apparent. The authors were prepared to promote the authority of their bishop, but only on the condition they he exercised it with the consent of the clergy. The authors also claimed a Petrine mandate for the clergy, claiming a separate prestige and inheritance. In Chapter 3, against the current view which sees *Collectio Avellana* as a canonical collection, I interpret the text as a complex late antique letter collection, reflecting aspects of both papal and episcopal sub-genres. I show that the compiler's objectives were to defend the record and reputation of Pope Vigilius (537-55) and his position on the Three Chapters; to track developments in doctrinal and jurisdictional primacy and to assert the Church's claims to both of these; and to outline the terms of an appropriate relationship between the emperor and the Roman Church. In Chapter 4, I compare patterns of patronage before and after 476. I suggest how the Church unified as a result of the emergence of the pope as the its main patron, and of the clergy's participation as its members started to share in the wealth of the institution. I also show that Roman bishops focused on their pastoral responsibilities in the city and that they introduced new saint-cults and developed existing ones as a new form of patronage, underlining the religious and ecclesiastical nature of their authority in the city.

CHAPTER 2

The *Liber Pontificalis* and Papal Authority

Analysis of the first edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* reveals how the Roman Church developed as an institution and casts light on how and why it asserted its authority in the years 476-536. The edition was compiled in a critical period in the Church's history: this period opens with the demise of the line of western emperors and closes with the start of the emperor Justinian's reconquest of Rome and Italy in 536, virtually the same date as the compilation. It saw the Acacian schism (484-519), a major rift between the Roman Church and the patriarchal sees in the East. Closer to home it also witnessed the Laurentian schism (498-506/7), a division in the Church resulting from the competing elections of Symmachus and Laurence as bishop of Rome. According to some historians, for most of this time the Church enjoyed relative independence, due mainly to the protection provided by the Herulian Odoacer (476-93) and the Ostrogothic king Theoderic (493-526), and it took the opportunity to assert its authority. Another view would see the Church no longer supported by the structure of the western empire and needing to re-establish its authority. The *Liber Pontificalis* is a text intended to assert papal authority. There is debate over the precise nature of that authority, and how and in what context the editors constructed popes' authority.

In this chapter I argue that the *Liber* was a response to events much deeper than the Laurentian schism, events which had been in train since c.476: the demise of western emperors and challenges on doctrine from eastern emperors, starting with the emperor Zeno's *Henotikon,* which he issued in 482. The environment in which the Church operated changed significantly and members of the Church sought to assert its authority and re-define the organisation. I show how the *Liber* was part of the institutional response. The editors were particularly concerned to assert the Church's claim to doctrinal primacy, a core feature of its identity and the major source of its authority.

The Liber Pontificalis*: Manuscripts, Editions and Sources*

The *Liber Pontificalis*, or the *Gesta Pontificum* as it is known in some of the oldest manuscripts, comprises serial biographies of popes from the time of St Peter.[1] It is known from

[1] L. Duchesne (ed.), *Le* Liber Pontificalis: *Texte, Introduction et Commentaire,* 2 vols (Paris, 1886-92). English translation by R. Davis, *The Book of the pontiffs* (Liber Pontificalis): *The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Bishops to AD 715,* Translated Texts for Historians, no. 6, 3rd edn. (Liverpool, 2010). Hereafter the text will be referred to as the *Liber Pontificalis*, the *Liber* or, in footnotes the *LP*. Where editorial content or a text other than the *Liber Pontificalis*, but in Duchesne's edition, is referenced, the reference will remain *Le* Liber Pontificalis.

some 70 or so extant manuscripts.[2] Most continue the lives of popes beyond the original composition of the text (c.536). In some, only a list of names of the subsequent popes was added to the core text. Louis Duchesne, who edited the text in the late nineteenth century, suggested five main classes of manuscripts: A through to E, and two classes of abridgements (the Felician and Cononian epitomes), F and K respectively. He determined classification on the basis of textual similarity and/or the identification of a common ancestor. Each class has a sub-class or sub-classes which is/ are represented by at least one manuscript.[3] Duchesne's overall analysis of all the entire range of the manuscripts has not been revisited, although Theodore Mommsen also edited the text in the nineteenth century and proposed three classes: I, II, III.[4]

Relatively little is known about how the *Liber* was initially circulated or transmitted. The earliest extant manuscript that contains the *Liber*, the Class B *Neopolitanus* IV, dates from the seventh century. The next oldest are three manuscripts from the eighth century: the Class A codex *Lucensis* 490, the Class B *Taurinensis*, F. IV.18, and the Class C *Leydensis Vossianus* 60. Sixteen manuscripts, thought to date from the ninth century, contain versions of the *Liber*: three contain the Felician epitome, two the Cononian version; seven Class B, two Class C and two Class D variants are in the other codices. Most of these pre-tenth century manuscripts are of Frankish origin although the provenance of the *Neopolitanus* IV and the *Taurinensis*, F. IV.18 was Bobbio in Northern Italy.

The codicological contexts of the extant manuscripts say nothing about the nature of the first edition of *Liber*; they only indicate how it was received. Friedrich Maassen showed in relation to the ninth-century codex *Parisinis* 1451, that a copy of the Felician epitome was added to its collection of canons in Gaul in c.590. Duchesne suggested it was included because it provided popes' names, which contributed to a better understanding of canonical texts.[5] In the eighth-century *Lucensis* 490, the *Liber* is to be found with Chronicles of Jerome and Isidore of Seville, Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical* History (as continued by Rufinus), Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, Gennadius' *Ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, two pieces on the Easter cycle, a fragment of Isidore's

[2] This figure is taken from C. Gantner, 'The Lombard Recension of the Roman *Liber Pontificalis*', *Rivista di Storia del Cristianesimo, Da vescovi di Roma a papi. L'invenzione del* Liber Pontificalis, 10, (2013) (1), p. 65. If all the fragments identified by Duschesne are included, the figure exceeds 80.
[3] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, 'Les Manuscripts', pp. clxiv-ccvi; see also, Gantner, 'The Lombard Recension', p. 67.
[4] T. Mommsen (ed.), *Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum vol I, Libri Pontificalis, Pars Prior*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1898). Mommsen's Class I mainly includes Duchesne's Class A manuscripts, Class II mainly Classes B, C, and D. and Class III mainly Class E. See pp. iv-v.
[5] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, Chapter 3: 'La Première Édition', p. lii: '*le Liber Pontificalis*, sous la forme de l'abrégé félicien, était connu en Gaule et annexé à une collection canonique, avec la Notitia provinciarum imperii et la Notitia Galliarum, comme document utile pour l'intelligence des textes canoniques; les deux notices géographiques servaient à se retrouver dans les noms des conciles, le *Liber Pontificalis* dans les noms des papes'.

Origins, the *Apostolic Canons*, and a Spanish epitome of a canonical collection.[6] Here, the *Liber* appears to be part of a collection more concerned with history than with canons, although the latter are also present. In neither of these cases does content of the codices shed any light on why the first edition was compiled.

Duchesne considered that two editions of the *Liber* were compiled in the first half of the sixth century. He argued that the writing of the first edition, ending with the life of Felix IV (526-30), commenced in the pontificate of Hormisdas (514-23). He suggested that the lives from Anastasius II (496-98) through to Felix were written at the same time, possibly by the same person. He considered a second edition, which he designated 'P', added lives from Boniface II (530-32), to Silverius (536-37) and entailed a reworking of the first. He thought that P had been produced in the pontificate of Vigilius (537-553) by someone who had witnessed the siege of Rome in 537-38.[7] Duchesne argued that the text of the original edition had not survived. Instead, he suggested that there had been three or four manuscripts of the original: one formed the basis of the second edition P; two others were the sources for the Felician and the Cononian epitomes; a fourth had been called on by the compilers of the original Class E manuscript, which itself was the combined product of the first and second edition.[8] Duchesne established the text of the second edition P with its successive continuations up to Stephen V (885-891).[9] He also attempted to reconstruct the first edition on the basis of the two epitomes and P. He thought that the Class A manuscripts were the most reliable for establishing the first edition.[10]

As identified by Duchesne, the sources used by the editors of the first edition included the Liberian Catalogue, lists of Roman bishops compiled in the fifth and sixth centuries, Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, several *Gesta Martyrum*, two fictional accounts of councils supposedly held in Rome at the time of Nicea, and the apocryphal letter from Pope Clement to the apostle James.[11] The Liberian Catalogue, part of the Chronology of 354 which was also known as the Philocalian Calendar, was an important source. It comprises a list of popes from Peter to Liberius (352-66), usually with the names of the emperors of the time, and of those who were consuls at the beginning and end of the pontificates. Duchesne demonstrated where these and some of its short notes were reproduced in the *Liber*.[12] As such, the Catalogue may be considered the prototype for the *Liber*. The fictional accounts of councils, the *Constitutum Silvestri* and the Council of 275 Bishops, were part of Symmachan Apocrypha, propaganda generated in the Laurentian Schism that has survived.

---

[6] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, 'Les Manuscrits', pp. clxiv-vi.
[7] *Le* Liber Pontificalis: 'La Date du *LiberPontificalis*', pp. xxxiii-xlviii.
[8] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, 'La Première Édition', pp. lvii-lxvii and 'Histoire du Texte', pp. ccxiii.
[9] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, 'Première Édition Restitutée', pp. 46ff.
[10] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, 'Histoire du Texte', p. ccxiii.
[11] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, 'Les Sources'. p. lxviii.
[12] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, pp. 1-9.

In recent years Duchesne's chronology of the editions has been challenged by Herman Geertman who argues that P is in fact the first edition, and that it ended with the pontificate of John II (d. 535), rather than with that of Felix IV (d. 530).[13] He focuses on palaeographic evidence and content; he has not revisited Duchesne's analysis of the *Liber's* manuscripts. He argues that it had three editorial phases. He distinguishes Phase 1 (P1) and P2 on the basis of their internal coherence. He shows that P1 comprises four rubrics or categories of information in each papal biography: prosopography and chronology, details of ordinations, notices of administrative, liturgical and doctrinal measures, and facts about papal and imperial patronage. It has an overall unity of style but lacks narrative. P2 is characterised by narrative, 'extensive historic additions', which dwarf other content and address four main themes: the Council of Nicea and conflicts with emperors with Arian leanings; the Council of Chalcedon and monophysite tensions; five double elections of popes; and claims of misgovernance against reigning popes.[14] He points to parallels between the earlier and later content of this phase, arguing that former need to be understood in terms of their significance for reports of contemporary popes.[15] He considers that P3 is a retouching of P2 with minor additions, except for the inclusion of an explanation of the hierarchical and chronological relationship between the first four popes (i.e. from Peter to Clement). He argues that the Felician and Cononian epitomes also derive from P2 in that they do not include the new content or the additions of P3.[16] He focuses little on the sources that the editors may have used, only specifically acknowledging borrowings from the Liberian Catalogue. He also says little about the dating of the three editorial phases, noting only that P1 was enriched not much later with the historic additions of P2; that P3 was compiled contemporaneously with or not much later than the Felician and Cononian epitomes; and that the editing was finished in the years 530-35 or a little later.[17] Geertman's analysis is relatively new, and historians are still beginning to consider its implications.

Historiography

The *Liber Pontificalis* has a very wide-ranging historiography but it is much more limited when it comes to explaining the first edition. Historians who seek reasons for the compilation and/or

[13] H. Geertman, 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis* romano. Un processo di organizzazione della memoria' in F. Bougard and M. Sot (eds.) *Liber, Gesta, histoire: Écrire l'histoire des évêques et des papes, de l'Antiquité au XXIe siècle* (Turnhout, 2009), pp. 37-107. He has separately integrated the Duchesne and Mommsen editions for pontificates between those of Miltiades and John II (311-535) but this does not amount to a new edition — 'Documenti, redattori e la formazione del testo del *Liber Pontificalis'* and '*Le Biografie del* Liber Pontificalis *del 311 al 535* in H. Geertman (ed) *Il Liber Pontificalis e la storia materiale,* Atti del colloquio internazionale, Roma 21-22 febbraio 2002, *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome*, 60-1 Assen (2003), pp. 267-84 and 285-355.
[14] Geertman, 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis*', pp. 41-42.
[15] Geertman, 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis*', p. 43.
[16] Geertman, 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis*', p. 45.
[17] Geertman, 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis'*, pp. 41, 45 and 37.

to explain the context in which it was compiled fall into three broad groups which are not mutually exclusive: first, Duchesne and those who follow him consider the Laurentian schism (499-506/7) the cause; second, those who follow Geertman's structural analysis identify the Gothic Wars as the context, and attribute to the *Liber's* editors an agenda of furthering the bishop's secular ambitions; third, others suggest a more generalised intention to assert papal orthodoxy and independence from imperial control. In their explanations, historians have not in all cases focused only on the first edition.[18]

Duchesne identified the Laurentian Schism, which resulted when two candidates, Symmachus and Laurence, were elected bishop of Rome in 498, as the immediate cause for the compilation of the *Liber*. The consequent schism lasted from 499 until 506/7. He argued that the *Liber* was a response to a similar, but pro-Laurentian, serial history of the popes of which only a fragment survives. As the *Laurentian Fragment* mentions the end of Symmachus' life in 514, his death in is taken as the *terminus post quem* for the compilation of both the *Fragment* and the *Liber*. There is support for Duchesne's view in borrowings from Symmachan apocrypha and the positive presentation of Pope Symmachus in the *Liber*.[19] This being so, the text is viewed by some as a pro-Symmachan document, written by editors sympathetic to the pope and his policies, a sentiment that was still relevant in c.530 when another double election showed that the earlier divisions were still alive.[20] Many historians have accepted Duchesne's view as a full or partial explanation. While his analysis of the editions' chronology prevailed, there was little attempt to go beyond the schism as a reason for the compilation of the text.

Geertman's structural analysis offers the possibility of three sets of reasons for the compilation for the *Liber's* first edition. He argues that the aim of the editors of P1 was to outline an image of the bishops of Rome as administrators and benefactors with a dignity equal to that of worthy emperors, in other words to provide a pontifical history that could be compared with imperial history (*historia augusta*).[21] He considers the editors of P2 had two objectives: first, to underline the independent position of the bishop of Rome, his continuing care for the faith and defence of orthodoxy, and the status of apostolic see; second, to provide an interpretative perspective on the conflicts that took place between 498 and 532 and in which the bishops of

[18] T.F.X Noble, 'A New Look at the *Liber Pontificalis', Archivum Historiae Pontificae,* 23 (1985), pp. 347-58, sees the *Liber* partly as a textbook for the uninitiated and a ready reference for veterans, and partly as an institutional history but his assessment is based on the notices from Boniface II to Leo III (530-816) which were strictly contemporary. He says nothing about the reasons for the compilation of the first edition.
[19] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, 'L'Histoire et La Chronologie des Papes*',* pp. xxx-xxxii and pp. cxxxiii-cxl.
[20] On the continuing divisions see D. Moreau, '*Ipsis diebus Bonifatius, zelo et dolo ductus:* The Root Causes of the Double Papal Election of 22 September 530' in Dunn (ed.), *The Bishop of Rome in Late Antiquity*, pp. 177-95. Also, Geertman, 'La genesi del Liber Pontificalis', p. 45. Geertman suggests that the forces behind the Laurentian schism were not spent.
[21] Geertman, 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis*', p. 43.

their time were involved.[22] He offers no explanation for P3 beyond observing that someone considered it necessary to spell out the chronological and hierarchical relationship between the first four popes.[23]

Rosamond McKitterick follows Geertman in accepting his identification of P as the first edition, and in seeing the text as a '*historia augusta*'.[24] She broadly accepts his date for the compilation, c.535, although she thinks a case could be made for it being slightly later, 536/7.[25] She argues that the *Liber* is a Christianised history of Rome, compiled as part of a strategy for constructing popes as rulers of Rome in the place of emperors.[26] She identifies imperial biography as the model for the *Liber*: she argues that its structure is very similar to Suetonius's *Lives of the Twelve Caesars* and its continuators, the *Kaisergeschichte* (Aurelius Victor's *De caesaribus*, the anonymous *Epitome de caesaribus*, Eutropius's *Breviarium* and the *Historia Augusta*).[27] In doing so, she privileges structure over content: whereas Duchesne identified the Liberian Catalogue and martyr narratives as sources of the *Liber*'s structure and information, she considers they simply provided the latter and asserts that structural models 'are far more significant for our understanding of the text as a whole'.[28] However, she does not address the more fundamental model or structure which, I consider, lies behind that Liberian Catalogue and the *Liber*, i.e. the episcopal list.[29] McKitterick also argues that the appropriate context for the compilation of the first edition was the Ostrogothic Wars, or, more specifically, political relations with Ostrogothic kings and Eastern emperors which popes needed to manage as they developed their claim to temporal rule in Rome.[30]

Philippe Blaudeau follows the interpretations proposed by Geertman and McKitterick, although he primarily sees the *Liber* as a text concerned with relations between Rome and Constantinople. He accepts that the Laurentian schism prompted the compilation of the *Liber* and he follows Geertman's analysis. He accepts McKitterick's argument that the *Liber* belonged to a tradition reaching back to Suetonius, and he states that 'Its subject was none other than the head of the institution that stepped into the shoes of imperial power, concentrating in the *urbs* the display of its religious power, and establishing, with the *urbs* at its

[22] Geertman, 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis*', p. 43:
[23] Geertman, 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis*', p. 45.
[24] See McKitterick, 'Roman Texts and Roman History', pp. 19-34; also, her chapter, 'The representation of Old Saint Peter's basilica in the *Liber Pontificalis'* in R. McKitterick, J. Osborne, C.M. Richardson and J. Story (eds) *Old Saint Peter's, Rome,* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 95-96.
[25] Specifically, to after the death of Pope Agapetus in 536. See McKitterick, 'Roman Texts and Roman History', pp. 19-20.
[26] Expressed fully by McKitterick in these terms in 'The representation of Old Saint Peter's', p. 96.
[27] McKitterick, 'Roman Texts and Roman History', pp. 29-33.
[28] McKitterick, 'Roman Texts and Roman History', p. 30.
[29] Duchesne discussed the Liberian Catalogue and episcopal lists at some length in Chapter 1 of *Le* Liber Pontificalis, pp. i-xxxii.
[30] For this see McKitterick's statements on pp. 20 and 23-24 in 'Roman Texts and Roman History'.

centre, an efficient network of command and representation'.[31] Blaudeau brings to his interpretation of the *Liber* significant knowledge of relations between the churches of Rome and Constantinople in this period, and his view that, starting with the pontificate of Leo I (440-61), the papacy initiated a project to assert its primacy over the East.[32] Among some wide-ranging observations, he suggests that the editors promoted Leo positively, that their aim in narrating the Acacian schism was to show Rome at the centre of affairs, and that they sought to assert emperors' acceptance of popes' claims in their accounts of the receptions of Hormisdas's embassy in 519 and of Pope John I in Constantinople in 526.[33] He considers that the *Liber* shows an awareness of transformations underway between the reigns of Leo I and John II: in particular it underlined the papal claim to exercise in the East a primacy founded on the principle of condemning any resurgence of miaphysitism. He suggests that the *Liber* offered the reader an *aide-mémoire* of pre-Justinianic reconquest relations between Rome and Constantinople, and that it affirmed that the glory of the apostolic see only acquired its true meaning when set in the perspective of its activities in respect of the East.[34]

Historians who have suggested other reasons for the *Liber's* composition include Kate Blair Dixon, Deborah Deliyannis and Samuel Cohen, the first of whom follows Duchesne closely, while the latter two adhere to Geertman's structural analysis. Blair Dixon is mainly concerned to compare the *Liber* and the *Collectio Avellana*; she suggests that what the two texts have in common is an interest in schisms: 'the *LP* (sic) was written, re-edited, and continued with an interest in schisms'.[35] Although she considers that the *Collectio* presents a defence of the bishop of Rome as a keeper of orthodoxy and the defender of Roman primacy, she makes no similar claim for the *Liber*. Deliyannis' more recent article on the *Liber* suggests that papal relations with Constantinople, specifically the Acacian schism, were an additional stimulus to the Laurentian schism for the *Liber's* compilation.[36] Additionally, she argues that the *Liber* presented a new argument for Rome's primacy based on doctrinal purity, i.e. the record for orthodoxy of its bishops. Importantly, she notes the argument for primacy was developed in Pope Hormisdas's *libellus*, which required acknowledgement that the Catholic religion had always been preserved untainted by the apostolic see, for which the *Liber* provided corroborating evidence. She suggests that the *Liber* formed part of the background preparation

[31] P. Blaudeau, 'Narrating Papal Authority (440-530): The Adaptation of the *Liber Pontificalis* to the Apostolic See's developing claims' in Dunn (ed.), *The Bishop of Rome in Late Antiquity*, pp. 127-40; quotation on p.128.
[32] See Blaudeau, 'Rome contre Alexandrie?', pp. 140-216, especially 140-45.
[33] Blaudeau, 'Narrating Papal Authority', pp. 138-40.
[34] Blaudeau, 'Narrating Papal Authority', p.140.
[35] K. Blair Dixon, 'Memory and Authority in Sixth-Century Rome: the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana'* in Cooper and Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage*, pp. 59-76 but especially p. 66 and pp. 69-70.
[36] D. Deliyannis, 'The Roman *Liber Pontificalis*, Papal Primacy and the Acacian Schism', *Viator* 45(2) (2014), pp. 1-16.

for Hormisdas's embassies to Constantinople in 516 and 519. Cohen focuses on six appearances in the *Liber* of popes acting against Manichaeans and suggests that they represent a small discursive project intended to represent the Roman Church as the defender of orthodoxy, and to stress its independence from imperial interference.[37] He acknowledges Laurentian schism as the immediate context for the *Liber* but considers that it was also influenced by the disputed election of 530 and the Ostrogothic Wars.

In this chapter I offer a different perspective to those detailed above. I find Geertman's structural analysis persuasive, although I disagree with aspects of his interpretations of the three phases which I discuss below. I do not agree with McKitterick's argument that the *Liber* was an alternative, Christianised history of Rome designed to prepare the way for the popes to become secular rulers in Rome; as I show below, insofar as it was a history, it was one of the Roman Church as an institution, not a history of the city. As I show, in essence the *Liber* concerned the Church as an ecclesiastical institution. Blaudeau is correct in suggesting that the *Liber* should be understood in context, and that from 451 the Roman Church was asserting its doctrinal primacy. However, I do not agree that the editors presented Leo I positively, and I think that popes had less agency than Blaudeau suggests. I consider the more immediate problem was not the resurgence of miaphysitism, which popes could not tackle on their own, but the need to establish and maintain the claim to doctrinal primacy in the face of the challenge from eastern emperors. I suggest that Deliyannis is far more on point in suggesting that the relations with Constantinople were a stimulus for the *Liber's* compilation, but I express this as a challenge to Rome's claim to primacy on doctrine, and I consider the co-stimulus to be, not the Laurentian schism, but the fallout from the demise of western emperors. One flaw with the idea that the Laurentian schism stimulated the *Liber* is the fact that the account appears in P2 and not in P1. Kate Blair-Dixon's statement that editors had interest in schisms has been frequently quoted but the types of schism need to be distinguished: the majority were double elections which raised an internal constitutional issue which the editors touched on in the text in ways quite different to their treatment of the Acacian schism.[38]

Argument and Methodology

I argue that the first edition of the *Liber* had its origins in, and reflected the reactions of members of the Roman Church to two major institutional challenges, the demise of the line of western emperors and the emperor Zeno's *Henotikon*. The editors responded in several ways. First, they sought to promote the authority of the bishop of Rome. Second, they attempted to

[37] S. Cohen, 'Schism and the Polemic of Heresy: Manichaeism and the Representation of Papal Authority in the *Liber Pontificalis*' in *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 8(1) (2015), pp. 195-230.
[38] K. Blair-Dixon, 'Memory and authority in sixth-century Rome: the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana*' in Cooper and Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage*, p. 66.

strengthen the Church's claim to doctrinal primacy as a core part of its identity. Third, they sought to advance the interests of the clergy: for instance, they showed that their promotion of episcopal authority was conditional on its being exercised with their consent.

Methodologically, I accept and make use of Geertman's structural analysis and I consider the content of the *Liber* in context. I consider his palaeographic analysis and division of the first edition into three editorial phases to be persuasive, but I differ in my interpretation of each phase, and I do not consider that the phases are as discrete as he implies. Whereas he suggests that in P1 the editors aimed to present popes as administrators and patrons worthy of comparison with emperors, and to produce a papal history comparable to an imperial one, I argue that they sought to promote the authority of the bishop within the Church, and to assert the doctrinal primacy of the Roman Church. While he considers that the editors of P2 set out to assert the independence of the bishop or Rome, the status of the Church and its defence of orthodoxy, I show that they intensified the assertion of doctrinal primacy, that they indicated that support for the bishop's authority was conditional on it being exercised with the clergy's agreement, and that they tentatively pointed to acceptable roles for secular rulers in the Church. Geertman notes the additional information on the first four popes in P3 but offers little by way of explanation; I argue that in their 'retouching' of P2, the editors of the final phase sought to strengthen the claim for doctrinal primacy, that they constructed a new argument for jurisdictional primacy, and that they claimed a Petrine mandate for the papal administration. I also show that the editorial phases are not as discrete and Geertman would suggest: the editors of all three phases argued for the Church's doctrinal primacy on the basis of the martyrial record of bishops of Rome.

In interpreting the *Liber*, I place the content in its historical context. I consider that the editors assumed a deep shared history with the reader and the text cannot be fully appreciated without an understanding of context. The wording is often brief and the language on occasion technical or specific. A prime example is the term 'executrix' in the account of the Acacian schism in the life of Pope Simplicius, which Raymond Davis translates as 'took official action'.[39] Instead, I suggest, that the editor intended the reader to understand the basis for the Church's action against Peter Mongos: the Roman Church considered it was the executor of the decision of the Council of Chalcedon. Gelasius used the term in a similar way when writing to the Dardanian bishops in 496 about Acacius: '*Ponamus tamen etiamsi nulla synodus praecessisset, cuius apostolica sedes recte fieret executrix.*'[40] The analysis and interpretations that follow are predicated on the assumption that an understanding of context is necessary.

[39] Davis, *The Book of Pontiffs*, Life 49.3, p.40 (3rd edn); *LP* 49.3: 'Eodem tempore fuit ecclesia, hoc est prima sedis apostolica, executrix'.
[40] *Collectio Avellana*, 95.49.

In the sections that follow, I address the four editorial objectives that I consider are apparent in the text: first, the promotion of the authority of the bishop in the Roman Church (Section 1); second, the assertion of doctrinal and jurisdictional primacy (Section 2); third, the promotion of the interests of the clergy (Section 3); fourth, the editors' attempts to mould Church-secular ruler relationships (Section 4). A final section (Section 5) considers the authors and the audience. I argue that the assertion of the authority of the pope in Rome (Section 1) was a response to situation that resulted from the demise of western emperors, and the major pre-occupation with doctrinal primacy (Section 2) a reaction to the challenges from eastern emperors that started with Zeno's *Henotikon*. I suggest that Section 3 provides a different insight on the clergy and on bishop-clergy relations. In addition, I argue that Section 4 shows that, following 476, the Church and secular rulers had to re-establish, or be more conscious about, their relationship.

Section 1: Promoting the Authority of the Bishop of Rome (Phase 1)

I argue that a major objective of the editors of P1 was to construct an image of the bishop as the source of authority in the Roman Church, and that this objective is to be understood as a response to the challenge of the new environment in which the Church found itself after 476. The editors attributed to almost all the popes a form of authority or activities, whether making decisions on discipline, introducing liturgical innovations, determining the organisation of the church (all of which I classify as 'ordinary decisions or decrees'), issuing decrees *de ecclesia* or *de omne ecclesia*, constructing churches or otherwise patronising them. The editors particularly attributed to popes decisions that contributed to two defining features of the Roman Church, the Roman Mass and its organisation. The editors present these decisions or actions as exercises in authority. In many cases there is no evidence for these statements other than in the *Liber*. The facts that the editors claim that almost all popes acted authoritatively in one way or another, and that some statements are contradicted by other evidence, point to a concerted attempt to construct the image of the bishop of Rome as one of authority and power. I consider that this a response to the loss of the support structure that had existed before 476 and had previously underpinned the position of the bishop in Rome.

In Table 2.1 I show the incidence of attribution.[41] I have grouped claims in the *Liber* into categories: discipline, liturgy, organisation and decrees *de* (*omne*) *ecclesia*. For current purposes I include under 'Liturgy' not only new elements in the Roman Mass, but also rules relating to the conduct of services and organisational arrangements such as Pope Simplicius's

[41] See the Appendix (Tables), pp. 172-74.

provision of clergy for the conduct of services at St Peter's, St Paul's and St Laurence's.[42] Discipline refers to behavioural rules other than those pertaining to the conduct of services. I discuss decrees *de* (*omne*) ecclesia in the next section on doctrinal primacy. The overwhelming use of *constituit, constituit ut* or *fecit constitutum* for these decisions is noticeable.

I suggest that the terms *constituit (ut)* and *fecit constitutum* were intended to imply that the decisions were equal to papal decretals and/or conciliar decisions. The editors invariably introduced ordinary decisions with *consitituit* or *constituit ut,* although there are two examples of such decrees where they use *fecit constitutum.*[43] For some organisational measures they used *dividit, fecit,* or *praecepit* but they also used *constituit* and *fecit constitutum*. They introduced all decrees *de ecclesia* and decrees *de omnia ecclesia* with *fecit constitutum*. Duchesne considered *fecit constitutum* was consistent with contemporary usage for papal decrees: Dionysius Exiguus used *constituta* in his prefaces to his *Codex Canonum* and *Collectio Decretorum Pontificum Romanorum* to refer to decisions of both councils and popes.[44] In letters both Popes Celestine and Leo I used *constituta* together with *decretalia*.[45] It is possible that the editors intended the usage to resonate with *constitutiones*, 'a term embracing all forms of imperial legislation'.[46] In an introductory edict to his *Codex* the emperor Justinian referred to abridging the multitude of constitutions (*constitutionum*) recorded in three ancient codices.[47] I suggest that the etymology is close enough to support the view that the editors intended *constituit* (*ut*) and *fecit constitutum* to imply decisions on a par with papal decretals and conciliar decisions. It also seems probable that they would have been happy with a possible resonance with imperial law.

Decrees affecting the Roman Church (Ordinary Decrees)

Ordinary decrees relate to practice in Rome and the editors specifically show popes to responsible for the Church's liturgy and its organisation. A significant number of the measures relate to the development of the Roman Mass, the central ritual of the Church. The *Liber* states that Pope Alexander (c.109-c.116) was responsible for inserting the Lord's Passion into the Mass, and Sixtus I (c.116-c.125) and Caelestius (422-27) subsequently instructed that the

[42] *LP* 49.2.
[43] *LP* 36.3 and 43.1. The two examples are Julius and Zosimus: 'constitutum fecit ut nullus clericus causam quamlibet public agere' and 'fecit constitutum ut diacones leva tecta haberent de palleis linostimis'.
[44] Dionysius Exiguus, *Collectio Decretorum Pontificum Romanorum, PL* 67, col. 0231A; *Codex Canonum Ecclesiasticorum, PL* 67, col. 0142A; *Le* Liber Pontificalis, 'Les Sources', p. cxxviii (69).
[45] Celestine, *PL* 50, col. 436A: 'Quae enim a nobis res Digna servabitur, si decretalium norma constitutorum … frangatur'; Leo, *PL* 54, col. 614B: 'omnia decretalia constituta tam beatae recordationis Innocentis quam omnium decessorum nostrorum'. Both references are quoted by Jasper and Fuhrmann, *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages,* pp. 17 and 22.
[46] Glossary, *The Codex of Justinian*, ed. by B. W. Frier et al, based on a translation by Justice Fred H. Blume (Cambridge, 2016), vol. 3, p. 3059.
[47]Justinian to Menas, April 529, c.1, *The Codex of Justinian*, vol. 1, p. 7.

Gloria in Excelsis Deo and 150 psalms of David were to be sung before the sacrifice.[48] Popes are also shown to have determined the ritual around the celebration of Mass: decisions that the sacrifice was to be celebrated over the memorials of martyrs and that altar coverings should be linen were attributed to Felix I (269-74) and Silvester (314-35).[49] Zephyrinus (198-217) decreed how the liturgy should be conducted in a way that reflected hierarchy: glass patens should held by ministers standing in front of *sacerdotes,* who themselves were to stand in front of the bishop while he celebrated Mass. Moreover, subject to episcopal dispensation, the clergy had to remain for the entire service.[50] The ritual unity of the Church was ensured by the institution of *fermentum*, the distribution of the consecrated host by the bishop to priests in the various *tituli*. Miltiades (311-14) was credited with introducing the practice, Siricius (384-99) with instructing that no titular priest should celebrate Mass without receiving it.[51] Other matters of the liturgy were covered: deacons were to use dalmatics in church, as was any person burying a martyr; objects used for ministry were only to be used by ministers. No monk or woman was to touch or wash a consecrated pall, and only a minister could place incense in the church.[52]

The Organisation of the Church

The editors of P1 also placed popes at the centre of its development of the Church and in the process outlined its organisational structure. The core functional units, other than the bishop, were the deacons and priests. The editors allocated to the distant past the initial establishment of their positions by a pope. Evaristus (c.100-10) 'divided the *tituli* in Rome among the priests and ordained seven deacons to watch over the bishop when preaching to safeguard the expression of the truth'.[53] Fabian (236-50) was said to have divided the regions among the deacons, and to have established seven sub-deacons to watch over seven notaries in order that they might faithfully record the acts of the martyrs in their entirety.[54] Dionysius (260-67) gave churches to priests and organised cemeteries and parishes as dioceses.[55] Marcellus (306-09) is reported to have organised the 25 *tituli*, over which priests presided, as 'dioceses for the baptism and repentance of many converts from paganism and for the burial of martyrs'.[56] The wider clerical membership of the Church, and the sense of its hierarchy, were conveyed by the

[48] *LP* 7.2, 8.3 and 45.1.
[49] *LP* 27.2 and 34.7.
[50] *LP* 16.2.
[51] *LP* 33.2 and 40.2.
[52] *LP* 24.3, 28.2, and 44.5.
[53] *LP* 6.2: 'Hic titulos in urbe Roma dividit presbiteris et VII diaconos ordinavit qui custodirent episcopum praedicantem propter stilum veritatis'.
[54] *LP* 21.2: 'Hic regiones dividit diaconibus et fecit VII subdiaconos qui VII notariis inminerent, ut gestas martyrum in integro fideliter colligerent'.
[55] *LP*, 26.2: 'Hic presbiteris ecclesias dedit et cymiteria et parrocias diocesis constituit'.
[56] *LP*, 31.2 'Hic fecit ... XXV titulos in urbe Roma constituit, quasi diocesis, propter baptismum et paenitentiam multorum qui convertebantur ex paganis et propter sepulturas martyrum'.

cursus honorum, which was outlined in the lives of Popes Gaius (282-95) and Silvester (314-35).[57] The *cursus* stated the different grades (reader, exorcist, acolyte, sub-deacon, guardian of martyrs, deacon and priest) and years of experience necessary in each before elevation to bishop was possible. The role of the *primicerius notariorum* and a major function of his section, the drawing up of all documents in the church, were also mentioned for the first time in the life of Pope Julius (337-52) although they more probably reflected the actual position in the early sixth century.[58]

The Attribution of Ordinary Decrees

The editorial desire to show individual popes as authoritative was, I consider, underscored by an attribution of specific measures to the bishops, which in some cases was not supported by evidence or was contrary to it. Duchesne long ago established that the attribution to particular popes was highly doubtful and, in some cases, their content had been taken from apocryphal canons.[59] Of the twenty decrees that the editors attributed to popes between Siricius (384-99) and Hilarus (461-68), he found that only two could be matched to the popes with whom they had been identified.[60] Instead, he identified a significant number of entries with 'canons' in the *Constitutum Silvestri* and the Synod of 275 Bishops, two extant documents of Symmachan apocrypha.[61] Joseph Jungmann has similarly observed that the assignment of the introduction of the *Gloria* to Pope Telesphorus (c.130) was pure fiction, as Hilary of Poitiers probably introduced it into the West after 359-60.[62] The only slightly chronologically credible entry for an organisational development is the statement that Pope Fabian (236-50) divided the regions among the deacons, as that appears in the Liberian Catalogue (compiled c.354).[63] I suggest that these allocations reveal not just a wish to promote the line of bishops of Rome but that there was also a specific content that editors wanted to include and they were not troubled by the needs of historical accuracy. This desire to promote the authority of bishops was also apparent in the detailing of papal constructions, although, given the nature of the evidence, these attributions may have been more accurate.

[57] *LP* 29.2 and 34.8, pp.161 and 171-72.
[58] *LP* 36.3. The attribution to Julius's pontificate may be another example of providing a lineage to offices. The existence of the Roman Church's *primicerius notariorum* and his deputy, the *secundicerius*, is otherwise first known from a letter sent by Dionysius Exiguus in 526 to Boniface and Notus, the holders of those positions. Dionysius Exiguus, *Epistola II Scripta Anno Christi Vulgari 526* (sic), *PL* 67, col 0023B.
[59] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, p. cxl.
[60] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, p. cxxxiii.
[61] *Le* Liber Pontificalis, pp. cxxxvii-cxl.
[62] J. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite* (London/New York, 1959), p. 238, n.2.
[63] Liberian Catalogue, *Le* Liber Pontificalis, p. 4.

Church Constructions

The editors used papal construction and patronage as indicators of authority, and to show how most, if not all, facets of the Roman Church were attributable to popes.[64] The construction of public buildings in Rome in the late empire was the preserve of emperors and the upper stratum of the senatorial class, and consequently papal constructions would have engendered some of the prestige associated with imperial and senatorial display. I suggest that the editors of P1 attempted to capture this, but more revealing was their attribution of almost all constructions and patronage to popes. They started to claim examples of popes' constructions of basilicas and cemeteries from the pontificate of Callistus onwards; they provided the most copious details for the reigns of Sixtus III (432-40), Hilarus (461-68) and Symmachus (498-514). The imperial patronage is only recorded in the life of Sixtus III and two of the three examples were partially attributed to the pope: it was at the pope's entreaty (*supplicatione*) and at his request (*ex rogatu*), that Valentinian III presented an image with 12 portals. 12 apostles and the Saviour, decorated with very precious jewels for the *confessio* at St Peter's, and a silver *fastigium* (colonnaded screen) to the Constantinian basilica; otherwise, unprompted, the emperor built a silver *confessio* at St Paul's.[65] Similarly, P1 records only one example of aristocratic patronage and even then the pope was given a significant intermediary role: the illustrious woman Vestina directed that a basilica was to be constructed with the proceeds of her ornaments and pearls; Innocent I established it as a *titulus* and endowed it with liturgical vessels and properties from the bequest.[66] This depiction of popes as the almost exclusive builders and patrons runs counter to what we otherwise know. Constantine's buildings, donations and endowments show a very different picture but the information appears in P2. In Chapter 4 I show that patrons before 476 included emperors, aristocrats and clerics, as well as popes. I suggest that the presentation in P1 reflects a very determined effort by the editors to place the bishop at the centre of the Roman Church, and to show multiple aspects of his authority.

If we need to understand the motivation behind the editors of P1's desire to support the authority of the bishop of Rome, I suggest decisions of the synods in Rome in 501 and 502, which took place during the Laurentian schism, provide some indication, and give an insight into the nature of papal authority at the time. The first synod, comprising bishops drawn from a wider area than suburbicarian Italy, was instructed by the Ostrogothic king Theoderic to

[64] I discuss papal constructions and patronage in Chapter 4.
[65] *LP* 46.4: 'Ex huius supplicatione optulit Valentianus Augustus imaginem auream cum XII portas et apostolos XII et Salvatorem gemmis pretiosissimis ornamatam … Fecit autem Valentinianus Augustus ex rogatu Xysti episcopi fastidium argenteum in basilica Constantiana…'
[66] *LP* 42.3: 'Quae femina suprascripta [Vestina] testamenti paginam sic ordinavit ut basilica sanctorum martyrum ex ornamentis et margaritis construeretur … In quo loco beatissimus Innocentius ex delegatione inlustris feminae Vestinae titulum Romae constituit et in eodem dominico optulit [dona]'. A list of gifts follows, comprising liturgical vessels (*LP* 42.4-5) and properties with an annual income of 1016 solidi (*LP* 42.6).

consider the charges raised against Pope Symmachus. Despite being pressed by Theoderic, the bishops decided they could not judge the pope, as 'according to the canons, appeals of all bishops are entrusted to him, and since he is appealing, what is to be done? … and the pontiff of this see cannot be tried before us according to any precedent'.[67] From this developed the fundamental principle that a pope could not be judged (*papa a nemine iudicatur*).[68] The second synod annulled a *scriptura* (instruction) that had been issued in 483 by the praetorian prefect Basilius on behalf of King Odoacer and with the consent of Pope Simplicius; inter alia, it had declared that church property, given in the hope of salvation and for the repose of souls, was not to be alienated under the threat of anathema.[69] The synod confirmed the views of bishops Laurentius of Milan, Petrus of Ravenna and Eulalius of Syracuse that, as a layman had issued it and bishop of Rome had not endorsed it, the *scriptura* was invalid. Symmachus was then invited to declare the law anew: 'as it is in your power to arrange what is to follow'.[70]

We know that two of the leaders, Laurentius of Milan and Petrus of Ravenna, who were not members of the Church of Rome and had previously withdrawn from communion with Symmachus, supported him, although we do not know why they did.[71] Avitus of Vienne, writing at almost exactly the same time to the senators Faustus and Symmachus and on the same issue, provides an answer. He supported the principle of non-justiciability of the pope: 'if the bishop of Rome is called into question, the episcopate itself, not just a bishop, will seem to be wavering'.[72] I argue that the decisions of the synods and Avitus's letter show that parties outside the Roman Church had, in certain circumstances, an interest in maintaining the position of the bishop of Rome and even enhancing it. If that was the case for external parties, the point must apply a fortiori to members of the Church, for whom the bishop of Rome's authority was critical insofar as he represented their Church. I suggest that in the period after 476, when the Church was less supported by the administration of the western empire, there was a perceived

[67] The decision not to pronounce judgement on Symmachus was taken at the Palmaris Synod in October 501 but the reasoning is laid out in an earlier report to Theoderic dated after 27 August 501: 'quoniam ipsi per canones appellationes omnium episcoporum commissae sunt, et cum ipse appellat, quid erit faciendum? … et pontificem sedis istius apud nos audiri nullo constat exemplo' — Relatio Episcoporum ad Regem, *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae*, DI (501) in T. Mommsen (ed.), *Variae Cassiodori senatoris*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, *Auctores Antiquissimi*, xii, (Berlin, 1894), p. 423 (para.10). The subsequent synod decided it was a matter for divine judgement: 'Symmachus papa sedis apostolicae praesul ab huiusmodi propositionibus inpetitus quantum ad homines respecit, quia totum causis obsistentibus superius designatis constat arbitrio divino fuisse dimissum, sit inmunis et liber', *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae*, DI, para. 24, p.431.
[68] Canning, *A History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 32.
[69] *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae*, DII, in Mommsen (ed.), *Variae Cassiodori senatoris* pp.443-55.
[70] *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae*, DII, para. 12, p. 448: 'Scimus provisionem vestram necessariis studere et ideo in vestra est potestate sequenda disponere'.
[71] On the withdrawal of Laurentius and Petrus from communion see MGH, *Auctores Antiquissimi*, vii, p. 59, quoted by Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy*, p. 91, n.46.
[72] Avitus, *Ep*. 34, trans. D. Shanter and I. Wood (eds.), *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose*, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 38 (Liverpool, 2002), p. 162.

need to promote the authority of the bishop of Rome. I suggest that this was one of the authors' concerns when they compiled the first edition of the *Liber*.

Section 2: Assertions of Doctrinal and Jurisdictional Primacy

Another objective of the editors of first edition was to assert the doctrinal and jurisdictional primacy of the Roman Church. The assertion in regard to the former was a response to Emperor Zeno's *Henotikon* (482) which precipitated the Acacian schism. The claim is evident in P1, and the editors of P2 and P3 pressed it further. The editors of P1 asserted doctrinal primacy in three ways. First, by claiming that popes issued decrees (*constituta*) *de ecclesia* and *de omne ecclesia* they presented historic examples of popes exercising leadership on doctrinal issues. Second, by claiming that a majority of the popes between St Peter and Miltiades (311-14) were martyrs, and that a number of other popes after Miltiades sought out heresy and/or heretics, they asserted a record of orthodoxy which underpinned a supplementary argument for primacy, i.e. that the apostolic see had always preserved the Catholic faith immaculately. Third, they presented a new argument that Peter was the source of all four gospels and, by inference, his successors were the custodians of orthodoxy. The editors of P2 and P3 enhanced the record of popes as martyrs. Those of P2 also brought into play the argument inherent in the statement the Church was the *sedes apostolica*, while those of P3 asserted that Peter was the source of all orthodoxy by positioning him against Simon Magus. The formulations of these assertions of doctrinal primacy need to be understood in the context of the Acacian schism and emperors' continuing attempts to define doctrine. The fact that all three sets of editors addressed the issue points to its enduring importance. The editors of P3 also constructed a claim for the bishop of Rome's jurisdictional primacy, a claim which I discuss at the end of this section.

Decrees De Ecclesia *and* De Omne Ecclesia

I consider that editorial statements in P1 that popes issued decrees (*constituta*) *de ecclesia* and *de omne ecclesia* were intended to assert the Roman Church's doctrinal primacy. While we cannot be completely certain as to the subject matter of these decrees, there are good reasons to think they concerned the pope's authority on doctrine. Terminology and the presence of 'ordinary decisions/decrees' suggest that these two other classes were intended to refer to those that applied outside Rome, with decrees *de ecclesia* probably purporting to have effect in the Latin West, and those *de omnia ecclesia* supposedly having effect in the East as well. The historical record points to a limited number of decisions or decrees that could have fallen in these categories: the dating of Easter, the treatment of returning apostates and the related issue of re-baptism, heresy and Christological disputes. However, as I show in Table 2.2, there is

almost no correspondence between popes to whom the editors attribute *constituta de (omne) ecclesia* and the popes who, we know from other sources, made decisions on Easter, apostates and re-baptism.[73] Clearly, the editors may have attributed the decrees in the same calculated fashion that they did with the ordinary decrees. However, as Geertman points out, 'decisions about the whole church occupy a special place and always come specially mentioned'. [74] I suggest that it is reasonable to assume that that this treatment entailed a degree of chronological accuracy. In addition, a majority of these decrees can be identified with pronouncements of Roman bishops on doctrine.

A majority of the statements that popes made these decrees are free-standing, with no supplementary explanation as to what they concern. The editors state that five popes (Pius I, Zephyrinus, Damasus, Anastasius I and Hilarus) issued decrees *de ecclesia,* and seven (Silvester, Mark, Siricius, Innocent I, Celestine, Felix III, and Gelasius I) issued decrees *de omne ecclesia*. There are five cases where other words follow but only two are helpful. In the life of Hilarus, mention of the decree *de ecclesia* is followed by '*ad sancta Maria',* which probably identifies a series of decisions given to Spanish bishops following a synod at Rome.[75] Siricius's *constitutum* is followed by '*vel contra omnes hereses et exparsit per universum mundum'* ('that is to say, against every heresy and he broadcast it through the whole world'), which can be taken as indicating the nature of the decree.[76] Otherwise, in the lives of Zephyrinus, Innocent I and Celestine, additional words appear to follow but '*et'* or '*vel*' is interposed, which could imply additional decrees or be interpreted as adding emphasis to the subsequent explanation. The words that follow in the lives of Zepherinus and Innocent do not suggest that they explain decrees affecting the (entire) church: the former, which rules on liturgical arrangements in Rome, and the latter, which refers to monastic regulations, hardly qualify as decisions affecting the whole church.[77] Celestine's *constitutum* is followed by '*maxime et religione, quas hodie archibo ecclesiae detenentur reconditae*' but the plurals in the relative clause again indicate that the additional words refer to a different decree.[78]

Four of the five decrees *de ecclesia* can be can be linked to popes' actions against heresy and/or Christological disputes. The inclusions of Pius I (c.145) and Zephyrinus (198-217) among the popes who issued *constituta de ecclesia* are now only intelligible in terms of the information which is contained in Eusebius' *History of the Church* and/or Irenaeus' Irenaeus, *Adversus*

[73] See the Appendix (Tables), pp. 175-78.
[74] Geertman, 'La Genesi del *Liber Pontificalis*', p. 40.
[75] *LP* 48.1. I discuss the synod below, pp. 55-56.
[76] *LP* 40.1.
[77] *LP* 16.2 and 42.1. In Innocent's case 'de omnem ecclesiam' is followed by 'et de regulis monasteriorum, et de Iudaeis et de paganis'. I suggest that 'constitutum' only covers 'omnem ecclesiam', and that other 'constituta' are implied for each of the other categories.
[78] *LP* 45.1.

Haereses.[79] We know from Eusebius that Pius was pope when Marcion of Pontus was active in Rome.[80] Marcion argued, inter alia, that it was inconceivable that Jesus could have been born of Mary. Pius may have presided over the synod of presbyters which expelled Marcion from the orthodox communion.[81] Eusebius also recounts Zephyrinus's handling of Adoptionism, which promoted the idea that Christ was merely human, and was adopted as the Son of Man at his baptism.[82] Based on their entries in the *History*, these two examples point to a possible Christological theme. While there are a number of reasons why the editors may have wished to mention Damasus (366-84), a connection can be made to the Christological theme. Rufinus, in his continuation of Eusebius's *History of the Church*, mentions that Damasus sought to suppress Apollinarianism, which taught that Christ assumed a body on his Incarnation.[83] In 377 Damasus presided over a synod that rejected this teaching in Rome, a decision that was subsequently supported by the First Council of Constantinople (381), at which it was the main theological issue.[84] Anastasius I's pontificate (399-401) was short but included a synod which condemned Origen's teaching on Christ's subordination to the Father.[85] Hilarus's decree *de ecclesia* cannot be linked with a Christological theme, in so far as it is identified with the synod of 485. However, he was Leo I's delegate at Ephesus II (449), the synod to which Leo first sent his Tome, and the editors separately stated that he issued a decretal (*fecit decretalem*) that was disseminated throughout the East. The text also states that he wrote letters confirming the synods of Nicea, Ephesus and Chalcedon and Pope Leo I's Tome, each of which pronounced on the nature and person of Christ.[86]

I suggest that actions against heresy and the Christological theme can be more clearly perceived in four of seven *constituta de omne ecclesia*, but not in the cases of Mark, Felix III and Gelasius. The life of Silvester (314-35) in P1 simply states that he issued a decree. The editors of P2 add details of Nicea and his condemnation of Arius, Callistus, Photinus and Sabellius, each of whom had an unorthodox position on Christ's nature.[87] Siricius (384-99)'s *constitutum*

---

[79] Eusebius, *History of the Church*; Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*.
[80] Eusebius, *History of the Church*, 4.11.1, 4.11.6f and 5.6.4, pp. 113-14, and 152.
[81] Argued by J.N.D. Kelly and M.J. Walsh (eds.), *Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, (Oxford, 2010), p.6.
[82] Eusebius, *History of the Church*, 5.28, pp. 175-78.
[83] *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia: Books 10 and 11*, trans. P.R. Amidon (Oxford, 1997), pp. 77-78.
[84] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p. 116.
[85] Kelly and Walsh, *Dictionary of Popes*, p.33.
[86] *LP* 48.1.
[87] *LP* 34.5. Arius thought, inter alia, that the son was subordinate to the father; Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, denied Christ's pre-existence, his deity and his endless kingdom – see Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society*, pp. 197 and 252. Sabellius, a modalist, allegedly taught that the Father, Son, and Spirit were merely three modes or manifestations of one underlying divine reality; as a sect, modalists denied that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit were different persons. It is strange to see Pope Callistus (217-22) in this company. However, Callistus had initially been sympathetic to Sabellius and Hippolytus, the pope's contemporary, accused him of modalist tendencies. Hippolytus has an entry in Jerome's *De inlustribus viris*, while Callistus does not; Eusebius referred positively to the former's writings but only mentioned the latter in passing. It is possible that this negative view of Callistus prevailed in the early

may relate to his management of a Roman synod in 392/3 that excommunicated the monk Jovinian, who questioned the post-partum virginity of Mary, or to his condemnation of Bonosus, who claimed that Mary had more children with Joseph.[88] On doctrinal matters, Innocent I (401-17) is known for his handling of the Pelagian heresy; at the request of African bishops he condemned Pelagius and his follower Caelestius.[89] Pope Celestine (422-27)'s decree almost certainly referred to his condemnation of the views of Nestorius, whose challenge to Mary's title of *Theotokos* (Mother of God) was interpreted as a denial of the significance of Christ's divinity for salvation: it was the highest profile issue in his pontificate: nineteen of twenty-five extant letters in the *Patrologia Latina* sent by or to Celestine relate to Nestorius and/or the First Council of Ephesus.[90] He condemned Nestorius's views at a Roman synod in 430 before ceding control of the Council to Cyril of Alexandria.[91]

The connection with Christological disputes and heresy is tenuous or non-existent in the cases of Mark, Felix III and Gelasius. Little is known about Mark's pontificate and there are no known decisions to which the decree can be linked. The editors state that the decree mentioned in the life of Felix III (483-92) was issued by priests and deacons after his death. The attribution to priests and deacons may be explained by the editors' promotion of consensual leadership which I discuss below.[92] Felix himself excommunicated Acacius and the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, a decision that formally set in motion the Acacian schism which has a strong Christological connection as it was prompted by attempts to revisit the definition of the nature of Christ.[93] It is difficult to know which decree or decision of Gelasius the editors had in mind as there is no obvious decision to which they may have intended to refer. In Chapter 3 I argue that the compiler used his letters on Pelagianism as an example of papal leadership on doctrine. In the context of the *Liber* it is equally possible that the editors had in mind Gelasius I's letter to the bishops of Lucania, Bruttium and Sicily, also known as the *Decretum Generale*, from which Dionysius Exiguous extracted 28 decretals at the beginning of the sixth century.[94] However, in summary, the majority of these examples, as with the decrees *de ecclesia*, can be linked with specific measures; they indicate that the editors of the *Liber* sought to show popes leading on doctrinal issues and against heresy.

---

sixth century. See *The Cambridge Dictionary of Christian Theology* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 318; Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, pp. 119-26; Jerome, *On Illustrious Men*, p.87; Eusebius, *History of the Church*, 4.20, 4.21, 4.22.

[88] Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society*, p. 327.

[89] *Collectio Avellana*, *Ep.* 41; Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society*, p. 453.

[90] Celestine's Letters, *PL* 50, cols. 0407-0566B.

[91] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p. 148. He observes at p. 16 that neither Celestine, nor his successor ever formally confirmed the decision of the Council.

[92] See below, pp. 54-58.

[93] Felix III, *Epp*. 6-8, in A. Thiel (ed.), *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum Genuinae et Quae ad Eos Scriptae Sunt: a S. Hilaro usque ad Pelagium II* (Braunsberg, 1868), pp. 243-50.

[94] Gelasius, *Ep.* 14, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, pp. 360-79. See also Neil and Allen, *The Letters of Gelasius I*, pp. 141-42.

The simple statements that popes issued decrees concerning the Church or the entire Church are assertions of authority in themselves, but, I suggest, there would have been a reasonably high level of recognition, at least in ecclesiastical circles, of the anti-heretical associations and Christological themes in some of these statements. In short, I consider there would have been some understanding that some of these statements were implicit claims about the Roman Church's leadership on doctrine. The later fourth and fifth centuries saw a considerable interest in heresy, orthodoxy and the nature of Christ, driven by a narrowing in the range of acceptable theological views and the on-going Christological debate, fuelled from the mid-fifth century by the miaphysite movement.[95] Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* had been available in Rufinus's Latin translation since the early fifth century. Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, and Gennadius's continuation (similarly, *De viris inlustribus*) provided high-level, historical overviews with their brief biographical notes of ecclesiastical figures and their writings up to the 380s and c.495 respectively.[96] In addition, the works of heresiologists, notably Epiphanius's *Panarion,* Filastrius's *Diversarum hereseon* and Augustine's *De heresibus.* and a number of other 'handbooks' on heresies that circulated in the West in the fifth and sixth centuries, attest to an interest in heresy.[97] Collectively, these show an extensive engagement on the subjects of heresy and Christology and offer the possibility that even the standalone statement *fecit constitutum de (omne) ecclesia* in some of the cases may have resonated with the reader as an assertion of doctrinal primacy. I consider that these examples of papal leadership on doctrinal issues were one of several means by which the editors sought to promote or protect the Roman Church's claim to primacy on doctrine; another was to claim that many popes had been martyrs.

Doctrinal Primacy: Martyr Popes

I argue that the editors of P1, and of the subsequent phases, sought to assert the Church's right to determine orthodox doctrine by claiming that a majority of popes were martyrs and, as the opportunity for attributing martyrdom was more limited after 312, they made a similar assertion for the later period by claiming that popes sought out heretics. In the early sixth century, members of the Roman Church considered its record for orthodoxy to be a component of its claim for doctrinal primacy; as a corollary of this, they were apt to point out the poor record of Constantinople and the Eastern churches. The assertion of the Roman Church's record was strongly presented in Pope Hormisdas's *libellus* which required eastern clergy, who wanted to

[95] For the increasing restriction in theological debate see R. Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, Transformation of the Classical Heritage, no. 23 (Berkeley, 1995).
[96] Jerome, *Liber de viris illustribus, PL* 23, cols. 632-761; *On Illustrious Men*. Gennadius, *De viris inlustribus, PL* 58, cols. 1059-1120A; *Lives of Illustrious Men,* trans. with notes by P. Schaff and H. Wace, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, 1969), pp. 385-402.
[97] J. McClure, 'Handbooks against Heresy in the West from the late fourth to the late sixth centuries', *Journal of Theological Studies,* 30(1) (1979), pp.186-197.

re-establish communion with Rome after the Acacian schism, to acknowledge that the apostolic see had always preserved the catholic faith immaculately.[98] I suggest that in drafting this claim, Hormisdas and his advisers had in mind the influential statement by Irenaeus of Lyon in the late second century that '… it is necessary for every church — that is, believers from everywhere — to agree with *this church, in which the tradition from the apostles has always been preserved* by those who are from everywhere, because of its more excellent origin' (*italics added*). [99] Popes tended to contrast this position with the record of eastern churches. Writing to bishops in Dardania in 493, Gelasius observed that heresies abounded among the Greeks.[100] The situation in the East from the 440s onwards, which saw the patriarchal sees undermined, if not overwhelmed, by the miaphysite movement, might have given force to this argument. To press the point home, Hormisdas's *libellus* required signatories to anathematise Nestorius ('once bishop of Constantinople'), Acacius (also, 'once bishop of Constantinople'), as well as the miaphysites Timothy Allurus and Peter Mongos of Alexandria, and Peter the Fuller of Antioch, and to follow the decision of Chalcedon (451) which condemned Eutychius, an archimandrite of a monastery near Constantinople, and Dioscorus, the patriarch of Alexandria.[101] The *libellus* set out a clear contrast between Rome's record and those of the other major sees. I argue that the editors of the *Liber* sought to express this argument by claiming that the majority of popes were martyrs and, after 312, that a number of popes sought out heretics.[102]

I consider that the question of popes' martyrdom was central to the editors' concerns. In the introductory letter to the *Liber* Jerome purportedly seeks to 'learn which of the bishops of your see deserved the crown of martyrdom and which of them is reckoned to have transgressed against the apostles'. As the letter is present in most of the oldest manuscripts, and as in certain respects it echoes the opening of Eusebius' *History of the Church,* I suggest that it is reasonable

[98] *CA* 116b.1: 'quia in sede apostolica immaculata est semper catholica servata religio'.
[99] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies,* III.2. I discuss this statement more fully in Chapter 1, pp. 12-13 and notes 13-15.
[100] *CA,* 79.4: 'apud Graecos, quibus multas haereses abundare non dubium est'.
[101] *CA* 116b.2-3: 'anathematizamus omnes haereses, praecipue Nestorium, …. Quondam Constantinopolitanae fuit Urbis episcopus …….Eutychen et Dioscorum Alexandrinum in sancta synodo, quam sequimur et amplectimur, Calcedonensi damnatos; his Timotheum adicientes parricidam Ellurum cognomento et disciplum quoque ipsius atque sequacemin omnibus Petrum Alexandrium; itemque condemnamus atque anathematizamus Acacium Constantinopitanum quondam ab apostolica sede damnatum compilcem atque sequacem …….. Petrum nihilominus Antiochenum damnates cum sequacibus suis et omnium supra scriptorium'.
[102] Deborah Deliyannis interprets the statement in Hormisdas's *libellus* that the Roman Church had always preserved the Catholic religion immaculately as meaning that the current pope stood in a line of unbroken succession from Peter. She sources the statement to Theodoret of Cyrrhus (d. 457), *Ep.* 116. She goes on to say that 'The heavy emphasis on the pre-Constantinian papal martyrs also serves to demonstrate the superiority of the Roman see's history'. See 'The Roman *Liber Pontificalis*', pp.7-8, p. 7, n. 29 and p.13.

to assume it was an integral feature of the first edition.[103] At this stage we cannot attribute the letter to any of the three editorial phases but, as a number of popes were stated in P1 to have been martyred (usually expressed by '*martyrio coronatur*'), I consider that the concern, and probably the letter, were present from the start. Further, the editorial intent in promoting popes as martyrs can be seen in the extent to which claims went beyond what could have been sustained in the early sixth century.

As I show in Table 2.3, the editors of P1 claimed that seventeen of the thirty-one bishops of Rome who preceded Miltiades (310-14) were martyred.[104] Of these seventeen, present-day historians consider that eight were not martyred and three others (Alexander, Felix I and Stephen I) were claimed as martyrs on the basis on mistaken identity.[105] However, the editorial intent should be judged on the basis of established or possible traditions of martyrdom at the beginning of the sixth century. Documents that the editors may have accessed include the *Depositio Martyrum* (a list of martyrs compiled as part of the Philocalian Calendar in 354), the *Communicantes* prayer in the canon of the Mass (settled in the form we know it today in the sixth century but would have been in existence in some form earlier), the so-called Leonine Sacramentary (whose contents are almost exclusively Roman and which was probably compiled at the end of the sixth century).[106] Other possible sources are *Gesta Martyrum* (deeds of Roman martyrs, many of which were composed between 475 and 550) and miscellaneous works such as Irenaeus's *Against Heresies* and Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*.[107] Of these the *Gesta* are the most problematic, being 'worthless as evidence', but they may have revealed an existing tradition or have helped to create one.[108] Even after accepting uncritically any evidence from these sources for an early sixth-century tradition of martyrdom, there remain

[103] Eusebius set out the chief matters to be dealt with in the work, including 'the names and dates of those who through a passion for innovation have wandered … from the truth' and the 'heroism with which, when the occasion demanded, men faced torture and death to maintain the fight in [defence of the divine message]'. *History of the Church*, 1.16, p. 1.
[104] The *LP* suggests 32 such bishops but as Cletus (No. 3) and Aneclitus (No. 5) were the same I have contracted the figure to 31, ignoring No. 5. For Table 2.3 see the Appendix (Tables), pp. 179-82.
[105] The eight popes are Linus, Cletus, Clement, Evaristus, Sixtus I, Victor, Callistus, and Anteros. The martyrial status of these and other popes and the claims in the *LP* are discussed in their individual entries in Kelly and Walsh (eds.), *Dictionary of the Popes.*
[106] For the crystallisation of the *Communicantes* and *Nobis quoque* prayers, see V.L. Kennedy, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass*, Studi di antichità cristiana no. 14, 2nd edn. (Rome, 1963), pp. 195-204, and A. Thacker, 'Martyr Cults Within the Walls', pp. 68-69. D.M. Hope, *The Leonine Sacramentary: A Reassessment of its Nature and Purpose*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford, 1971), p. 118, dates the compilation of the sacramentary, which contains masses of some saints whose *natales* fell between April and December, to the end of the sixth century.
[107] In theory an addition source is the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, first compiled in Italy before the middle of the fifth century, but in practice it offers no additional information. F. Lishitz, *The Name of the Saint: the Martyrology of Jerome and Access to the Sacred in Francia, 627-827*, Publications in Medieval Studies (Notre Dame, 2006), pp. 19-23, points out that all the manuscripts that have survived date from the eighth century or later and that, while it was compiled from multiple sources, it appears to have been heavily influenced by Aquileian and Burgundian traditions.
[108] R.A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 61.

five cases which lack any corroboration (Evaristus, Sixtus I, Victor, Anteros and Stephen I), and for two of them (Anteros and Stephen) there would have been evidence to the contrary.[109]

The editors of P2 and P3 appear to have tried to further strengthen the claim by enhancing the record of martyr popes. As I show in Table 2.3, the editors of P2 claimed that a further five popes (Cornelius, Lucius, Marcellinus, Felix II and John I) were martyrs, that an additional two (Urban and Gaius) were confessors and that another (Eutychian) buried 342 martyrs with his own hands, which may have laid the foundation for his designation as a martyr in P3. The editors of P3 claimed three more as martyrs (Anicetus and Gaius, in addition to Eutychian). Of these eight, Cornelius and John I are the only popes for whom, I suggest, there would have been some recognition of their martyrdoms at the time the P2 was written. Cornelius's life in the *Liber* was based principally on a *passio* written in the second half of the fifth century which was 'a work of pure fiction with no verifiable historical content'. [110] However, there was earlier and later recognition. The Liberian Catalogue records that he died 'with glory'; Jerome's *Vita Pauli primi eremitae*, composed in 379, referred to Cornelius suffering martyrdom at Rome under the emperors Decius and Valerian.[111] The Leonine Sacramentary, which would have reflected an established tradition, contains a mass which celebrates both Cornelius and Cyprian of Carthage as 'saintly martyrs'.[112] The death of John I (523-26) would have been very recent; the statement that he died a martyr in custody is intelligible in the light of his mistreatment at the hands of Theoderic.[113] For the remaining six popes (Anicetus, Marcellinus, Lucius, Gaius, Eustician and Felix II) there appears to have been little justification for their claimed martyrial or confessor status. Four are listed in the *Depositio Episcoporum*, not the *Depositio Martyrum*, which strongly implies that they were not considered martyrs in 354; and the *Liber* separately and inconsistently claims that Felix II died in peace on the estate to which he retired.[114] Marcellinus's history would have been particularly problematic: an apocryphal account circulated in the Laurentian schism declared him an apostate and, as such, he would have been a major blemish on Rome's record of orthodoxy. The *Liber's* account, which may have been

[109] The Liberian Catalogue states that Anteros had a natural death; Stephen I was listed in the *Depositio Episcoporum*, not the *Depositio Martyrum* — see Kelly and Walsh, *Dictionary of Popes*, pp.13 and 17. There are nine masses for a martyr Stephen in the *Sacramentarium Veronense* [ed. by L.C. Mohlberg (Rome, 1956), paras. 671-703, pp. 85-89] but D.M. Hope, *The Leonine Sacramentary*, pp. 42-43, states that these more properly relate to the proto-martyr. He discusses the pope's 'martyrdom', pointing out, inter alia, that the reference to the pope in the Life of Pope Leo IV (847-855) is to him as 'pontiff', not as martyr, for which see R. Davis, *The Lives of Ninth-Century Popes* (Liber Pontificalis), Translated Texts for Historians, no. 20 (Liverpool, 1995), p. 129, n. 2.

[110] M. Lapidge, *The Roman Martyrs: Introduction, Translations and Commentary*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford, 2017), p. 195.

[111] Liberian Catalogue, *Le* Liber Pontificalis, p. 6; Jerome, *PL* 23, col. 19, quoted by Lapidge, *The Roman Martyrs*, p. 196.

[112] 'pro sanctorum martyrum Corneli et Cypriani sollemnitatibus', *Sacramentarium Veronense*, para. 831, p. 104.

[113] *LP* 55.6: 'Qui tamen defunctus est Ravenna in custodia … martyr'.

[114] *Depositio Episcoporum* and *Depositio Martyrum*, *Le* Liber Pontificalis, pp. 10-12. On Felix II, *LP* 37.5.

based on a lost *passio*, states that he repented and with others was 'crowned with martyrdom'.[115] In total across the three phases and for the period up to 312, the editors claimed twenty-four of thirty-one popes were martyrs including eleven for whom there was unlikely to have been any tradition of martyrdom. For the period after 312, the editors sought to achieve the same objective by claiming that particular popes found heretics or addressed heresy.

Doctrinal Primacy: Finding Heretics

For popes who reigned after Constantine had established the 'Peace of the Church', the opportunity for attributing martyrdom was much more limited and, I suggest, editors sought to achieve the same objective, i.e. asserting the orthodox record of the Church, by presenting popes as opponents of heresy. As I show in Table 2.3, the claims that popes found heretics commence in the pontificate of Eusebius, which very shortly preceded the Edict of Milan, and chronologically follow all but one of the popes for whom martyrial status was claimed.[116] In a recent article Samuel Cohen identifies six incidences in the *Liber* of popes finding (*invenit*, or the passive *inventi sunt*) Manichaeans in the city: in the lives of Popes Miltiades, Siricius, Anastasius I, Gelasius, Symmachus and Hormisdas. He argues that the language of heresy was an important part of the process of emphasising the bishop of Rome's independence from secular and imperial interference.[117] He distinguishes the treatment of the last three popes from the first three, noting that there was no evidence to support the later claims and arguing that their 'successes in the defence of orthodoxy acted as validation and as an explanation for their status as the legitimate leaders of the Roman Church, and served to emphasise Rome's inevitable orthodoxy and continuity with the authentic faith.'[118] I agree with much of the thrust of Cohen's argument but think that the editors were expressing a wider claim. Other popes also found other heretics: Eusebius (c.310) found unspecified heretics; Innocent I (401-17) found Cataphrygians (Montanists); Leo I (440-61) the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies.[119] In addition, I argue that the statements that popes found heretics served the same polemical purpose as the claim that a significant number of popes were martyrs: both strands, which are largely sequential, contributed to the argument that popes and the Roman Church had a strong record of preserving the faith immaculately. A completely different assertion of doctrinal primacy was made by the editors of P2 who asserted that the Roman Church was the *sedes apostolica*.

[115] *LP* 30.3; Kelly and Walsh, *Dictionary of Popes*, p. 21.
[116] Eusebius' dates are given variously as 308, 309 and 310, for which see Kelly and Walsh, *Dictionary of Popes*, p. 22. Felix II (355-65) and John I (523-26) are the only two popes for whom martyrdom is claimed after 312; these claims were made in P2.
[117] Cohen, 'Schism and the Polemic of Heresy', pp. 205-06.
[118] Cohen, 'Schism and the Polemic of Heresy', p. 224.
[119] *LP* 32.2, 42.1, and 47.2.

Doctrinal Primacy: 'Sedes apostolica'

I argue that in their account of the Acacian schism, the editors of P2 also asserted the Roman Church's doctrinal primacy by presenting it as the *sedes apostolica*. As the terms on which the schism was settled show, it was fundamentally about papal primacy on doctrine, even if the Roman bishops' actions revolved around Acacius's resumption of communion with Peter Mongos and they justified the excommunications of the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch by reference to the Council of Chalcedon.[120] The account of the schism, which stretches over pontificates from Simplicius to Hormisdas (468 to 523, but excluding that of Symmachus (498-514)), is the longest narrative in the first edition. I argue that the editors expressed the claim for doctrinal primacy with the multiple use of the term *'sedes apostolica'*. It appears twice in P1, in the life of Sixtus I.[121] It then appears as *sanctae sedis catholicae apostolicae*, in the life of Hilarus.[122] In P2 it appears as *apostolicae ecclesiae Romanae* in the life of Leo I;[123] otherwise, *sedes apostolica* appears twenty- three times in P2, of which seventeen occur when the subject matter is the Acacian schism, and two when other significant interaction with Constantinople was reported. The first of the two other occasions was Pope John I's reception in Constantinople in 525.[124] The second referred to the reception of Justinian's confession of faith in 533, which was on part of the exchange of letters by means of which John II accepted the theopaschite formula.[125] When used, the term frequently conveys a sense of authority. Acacius, for example, appropriately reported Peter Mongus to Pope Simplicius, and 'the church, that is the first apostolic see, [became] the executor [of the decision of Chalcedon]'.[126] It appears in the passage which reports that Felix III excommunicated Misenus and Vitalis after they had succumbed to bribery, and failed to carry out their mission in Constantinople in the time leading up to the schism.[127] Often, the term was used when Rome was simply interacting with the emperor or Church of Constantinople.

The earliest recorded use of the term *sedes apostolica* was in a letter of Pope Liberius to Eusebius of Vercelli in 354.[128] I suggest its use in the *Liber* should be understood in the context of the sparring between Rome and Constantinople since 380 on the principle of precedence within the wider Church: whether it should be determined by reference to their apostolic status (the principle of apostolicity) or in accordance with the imperial arrangements (the principle of

[120] See Gelasius, *Ep.* 1, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, pp. 287-311 and Neil and Allen, *The Letters of Gelasius I*, pp. 83-108.
[121] *LP* 8.2.
[122] *LP* 48.1.
[123] *LP* 47.3 (Leo I).
[124] *LP* 55.2.
[125] *LP* 58.1.
[126] *LP* 49.3. See p. 34 above on the use of the term *executrix*.
[127] *LP* 50.2.
[128] Blaudeau, *Le Siège de Rome*, p. 197.

accommodation).[129] As I state in Chapter 1, by the end of the second century an understanding had developed that a church's apostolic foundation ensured the orthodoxy of its tradition and teaching. As Constantinople had no such origin and/or tradition, the editors of the *Liber* used *sedes apostolica* to narrate the schism, which was itself provoked by a challenge to Rome's doctrinal primacy. I argue that its use was a very clear assertion of primacy.

St Peter: the Source of all the Gospels and the Vanquisher of Heresy

Separately, the editors of P1 and P3 presented two additional arguments for Peter's special position in relation to the orthodox tradition. Those of P1 asserted that Peter was the source of all four gospels: the apostle 'wrote two epistles called catholic and Mark's gospel (because Mark was his hearer and son by baptism; later he was the complete source of the four gospels); when he was questioned, Peter confirmed them by his testimony. Whether in Greek, Hebrew or Latin, they are in agreement, and it was by his testimony they were confirmed'.[130] The closeness of the phraseology indicates that the editors took the references to the two letters and the gospel of Mark from Jerome's *De viris illustribus* although Jerome did not add that Peter also confirmed the other gospels.[131] Eusebius also only attributes the gospel of Mark to Peter.[132] The additional claim in respect of the other three gospels was new and transformed the account into the assertion that Peter was the source of the scriptural tradition.

I suggest that in stating that Peter had many debates with Simon Magus and that the latter was struck down by God's will, the editors of P3 implicitly presented the Roman Church as the guardian of orthodoxy which, with divine assistance, defeated heresy. The story of Peter and Simon Magus was well-known and, given that Jerome mentioned Simon in Peter's short biography, however briefly, the inclusion may seem unremarkable.[133] However, the account appears in the third editorial phase in which very few additions to the text were made and the ones made to Peter's Life are otherwise significant for papal claims to authority. I consider that this interpolation needs to be understood in the contexts of how Simon Magus was viewed since Irenaeus and of how popes were presented as successors of Peter in the *Liber*. In *Adversus haereses* Irenaeus argued that Simon was the source of all heresy.[134] Subsequent

[129] On this dispute, see Chapter 1, p. 15.
[130] *LP* 1.2: 'Hic scripsit duas epistulas, quae catholicae nominantur, et evangelium Marci, quia Marcus auditor eius fuit et filius de baptism; post, omnem quattuor evangeliorum fontem, quae ad interrogationem et testimonio eius, hoc est Petri, firmatae sunt, dum alius grece, alius ebraice, alius latine consonant, tamen eius testimonio sunt firmatae'. Translation by Davis, *The Book of Pontiffs*, p. 1.
[131]Jerome, *PL* 23, 828: 'Scripsit duas epistolas, quae Catholicae nominantur, Sed et … Evangelicum iuxta Marcum, qui auditor eius et interpres fuit, hujus dicitur'. Also, *On Illustrious Men,* I, p. 5.
[132] Eusebius, *History of the Church,* 2.15, p.49. Peter's hearers persuaded Mark to leave them a summary of Peter's instruction and so 'he became responsible for the writing of what is known as the Gospel according to Mark'.
[133] He was also mentioned in Eusebius, *History of the Church*, 2.13-14, pp. 47-49.
[134] Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, I. 23.2, *PG* 7, col. 0671: 'Simon autem Samaritanus, ex quo universae haereses substiterunt'.

theologians and heresiologists, particularly Hippolytus and Epiphanius of Cyprus followed this genealogical approach.[135] I suggest that the editors implicitly claimed for popes the leading role against heresy. This claim echoes those discussed earlier that popes found, and in some cases dealt with, heretics.

In summary, the editors promoted the Church's primacy on doctrine by claiming that popes had an established record of leadership on doctrinal issues; by constructing an image of popes as martyrs and/or as opponents of heresy; by presenting the Church as the *sedes apostolica*; and by asserting that Peter was the source of orthodox doctrine. The elements of these claims are apparent in P1 but, as I show, we see in P2 a deepening of the assertion that the Roman Church preserved the Catholic religion unstained (*immaculata*). In total, editors claimed twenty-three martyr popes out of a total of thirty-one between Peter and Miltiades, considerably in excess of what historians consider is supportable by contemporary tradition. The appearance in P2 of an existing argument that Rome's pre-eminence and primacy was due to its apostolic status was likely to have had a particular resonance at a time when Rome had lost the status that derived from its position as a residential imperial capital. The claims in respect of Peter as the source of orthodoxy, and that by inference his successors were its guardians, added an additional layer of claim and assertion. The editors of P3 also constructed a claim for jurisdictional primacy to which I now turn.

Jurisdictional Primacy

The editors included a claim for jurisdictional primacy by borrowing from and adjusting the sense of the apocryphal letter from Pope Clement to the apostle James. The main additions to the first edition in the final phase were extracts from Chapters 2 and 5 of the letter, which the editors inserted into the lives of Peter and Clement.[136] The letter had been known in the East since the late second or the early third century. Rufinus of Aquileia translated it into Latin in c.406-7, possibly to support Innocent I's assertions of primacy against the sees of Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch, when the pope intervened in the deposition of John Chrysostom.[137] Historians consider it to be a key element in the development of the concept of

[135] R. Flower, 'Genealogies of Unbelief: Epiphanius of Salamis and heresiological authority' in M.S. Williams, C. Kelly and R. Flower (eds.), *Unclassical Traditions Volume II: Perspectives from East and West in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 70-87, especially pp. 75-76; Young Richard Kim, 'The Transformation of Heresiology in the Panarion of Epiphanius of Cyprus' in Greatrex, Elton and McMahon, *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity*, pp. 53-68, especially p. 56; A. Marjanen, '"Gnosticism"' in S.A. Harvey and D.G. Hunter (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 204-05.

[136] *Epistula Clementis ad Iacobum,* in B. Rehm (ed.), *Die Pseudoklementinen II*: *Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung,* Die griechlichen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, Bd 51 (Berlin, 1965).

[137] B. Neil, 'Rufinus' Translation of the *Epistola Clementis ad Iacobum', Augustinianum,* 43(1) (2003), pp. 25-39.

juristic succession in the pontificate of Leo I.[138] The letter, as translated by Rufinus, claims that Peter ordained Clement as bishop, and passed on to him both the chair of his preaching and teaching (*praedicationis et doctrinae cathedram*), and the power of binding and loosing (*potestatem ligandi et solvendi*).[139] '*Cathedra'* is not further explained, except in so far as Clement, as Peter's companion in all things, knew the truth of that latter's preaching.[140] The author implied that the power of binding and loosing was disciplinary: he reported Peter as saying that Clement 'will bind what ought to be bound and loose what is to be loosed, as he clearly will have known the rule of the Church (*ecclesiae regulam*).'[141]

However, in borrowing from the apocryphal letter, the editors of P3 made some significant changes. In the life of Peter the power of binding and loosing was equated with the government of the Church: *gubernandi* appears in apposition to *potestas ligandi solvendique*.[142] In the life of Clement, the *cathedra* entrusted by Christ to Peter became the *ecclesia* passed from Peter to Clement: we are told that Clement, at Peter's command, took on the pontificate of governing the Church (*ecclesiae pontificatum gubernandi*) and that '[the reader] will find in the letter which was written to James how, just as the chair (*cathedra*) was entrusted and handed over by Christ to Peter, so the Church (*ecclesia*) was entrusted by Peter to Clement'.[143] The editors of the *Liber* transformed the mandates of binding and loosing and of preaching ('chair/cathedra'), as presented in the apocryphal letter, into the governance of the Church. A straight borrowing from the apocryphal letter of *praedicationis et doctrinae cathedram* would have reinforced the argument for doctrinal primacy that, I argue, is present in all the phases. Instead, I argue, the editors asserted a separate claim for jurisdictional primacy in the Church.

Section 3 A Clerical Agenda

While I consider that the editors of the *Liber* were mainly concerned to promote papal authority (most clearly in P1) and doctrinal primacy (across all phases), I argue that they also sought to

[138] See W. Ullmann, 'The significance of the *Epistola Clementis* in the Pseudo-Clementines', *Journal of Theological Studies,* NS 11(2) (1960), pp. 295-317; J. Canning, *A History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 31.
[139] *Epistula Clementis, Die Pseudoklementinen,* 2.2, p. 376: 'Clementem hunc episcopum vobis ordino, cui soli meae praedicationis et doctrinae cathedram credo'.
[140] *Epistula Clementis, Die Pseudoklementinen*: 2.2, p. 376: 'qui mihi ab initio usque ad finem comes in omnibus fuit et per hoc veritatem totius meae praedicationis agnovit'.
[141] *Epistula Clementis, Die Pseudoklementinen.* 2.4, p. 376: 'propter quod ipsi trado a domino mihi datam potestatem ligandi et solvendi, ut de omnibus quibuscumque decrevit in terris hoc decretum sit et in caelis. Ligabit enim quod oportet ligari et solvet quod expedit solvi, tamquam qui ad liquidum ecclesiae regulam noverit'.
[142] *LP* 1.5: 'Sicut mihi gubernandi tradita est a domino meo Iesu Christo potestas ligandi solvendique.'
[143] *LP* 4.3: 'Sicut ei fuerat a domino Iesu Christo cathedra tradita vel commissa; tamen in epistula, quae ad Iacobum scripta est, qualiter ei a beato Petro commissa est ecclesia, repperies'.

advance the position of the clergy in the organisation. I suggest that there are several manifestations of this agenda in the first edition. First, by managing the record and memory of popes, the editors made clear that their promotion of papal authority was conditional on that authority being exercised with the input and the consent of the clergy. As I will show, they enhanced the reputation of those popes who acted consensually and downplayed that of those who did not. Second, particularly in the account of Boniface II's pontificate, they expressed the need for clerical assent in the election of a pope. Third, they asserted the accountability of popes, in the process contradicting the principle of papal non-justiciability which was established in the Laurentian schism. Fourth, the editors of P 3 claimed a Petrine mandate for the papal administration. I consider that this editorial agenda is similar to contemporary imperial bureaucratic behaviour as observed by John Lydus in his *On Powers,* and would be recognised by current Rational Choice theorists as normal expressions of self-interest by players in an institution.

Consensual leadership.

A comparison of the accounts of the pontificates of Leo I and his successor Hilarus strongly suggests that the editorial programme to promote the authority of the pope was conditional on the clergy acquiring a role in the papal decision-making process. The editors conveyed this condition by controlling papal reputations. In P1, Leo's efforts at Chalcedon received a modest mention: we are told that he found two heresies, the Eutychian and the Nestorian, and that he frequently confirmed Chalcedon. [144] Only the Felician epitome of the *Liber* claimed that he issued a decree to the whole world (here a *decretalem*, rather than a *constitutum de omne ecclesia*).[145] This contrasts with the importance attaching to Leo's achievement that shines through the correspondence in the *Collectio Avellana*.[146] In contrast, the *Liber* gives Hilarus a major role post Chalcedon. He 'issued a decretal and broadcast it through the East, and letters on the catholic faith confirming the three synods of Nicea, Ephesus and Chalcedon and the Tome of the holy bishop Leo, and he condemned Eutyches and Nestorius and all their followers and all their heresies and confirmed the dominance and pre-eminence of the apostolic see.' In addition, Hilarus issued a decree *de ecclesia*.[147] In P2, Leo's notice was enhanced, and his

[144] *LP* 47.1.
[145] Felician Epitome 47, *Le* Liber Pontificalis, p. 90: 'et decretalem quem per universum mundum spargens seminavit'.
[146] For the emphasis on Leo in the *Collectio Avelllana* see Chapter 3, pp. 91-92. Blaudeau, 'Narrating Papal Authority', p. 134, argues this differently. He sees Leo's Christological teaching as a 'timeless deposit of faith, reflected in the *Liber Pontificalis* through the generic insistence on its place in the papal archive'. Cohen, on the other hand, 'Schism and the Polemic of Heresy', pp. 210-11, observes an omission of information in Leo's Life where a positive reference might be expected. He notes that Leo's well-documented attack against Roman Manichaeism is completely ignored in his *Liber*, although he suggests the pope's letters and sermons may not have been available to the compiler.
[147] *LP* 48: 'Hic fecit decretalem et per universam Orientem exparsit et epistulas de fide catholica contirmans III synodos Niceni, Ephesi at Calcidonense vel tomum sancti Leonis et damnavit Eutychem

Tome was stated to be the 'faith of the apostolic Church of Rome'. However, his record was still not presented as fulsomely as it was in the *Collectio*. The promotion of Hilarus, at the expense of Leo, might be explained by the relative patronage they offered, a credible criterion, as the *Liber* noticeably focuses on constructions and donations. Hilarus was a significant patron; inter alia, according to the P1 editors, he built three oratories at the Basilica Constantiniana and a monastery, baths, a residence and a library at or around St Laurence's.[148] However, Leo's patronage, if not of the same order, was not negligible. After the Vandals sacked Rome, he replaced silver vessels in all the *tituli*. Additionally, he renewed St Peter's basilica and apse vault, constructed an apse vault in the Basilica Constantiniana, and built a church to the bishop and martyr Cornelius.[149]

I suggest that the editors of P2 explain this depiction of Leo. In the events leading up to Chalcedon, they recorded that he issued orders on his own authority (*sui auctoritate*). It is possible that the phrase is a comment on his position vis-à-vis the emperor Marcian. However, in the light of what follows, I argue that this is a negative comment on the way Leo exercised his authority: he made decisions on his own, and without consultation. There are no extant records from Leo's reign against which this assessment can be judged. However, there is evidence that Hilarus acted consensually, and in ways that were likely to have appealed to the clergy. The record of a Roman synod (465), identified in the *Liber* as the occasion for his decree *de ecclesia*, survives. The synod made decisions on two questions raised by Spanish bishops: whether a man, who had married a woman who was not a virgin, could aspire to holy orders, and whether a bishop could designate his successor?[150] In regard to the first, the record shows that Hilarus acted consensually: he invited the judgements and the formal assent of the bishops and priests.[151] This pattern of arriving at the judgement was repeated for the second question.[152] The latter may have been particularly relevant for the Roman clergy, as it raised the same issue of principle that was to vex them at the time of the *Liber's* compilation: Boniface II (530-32)'s attempt to designate Vigilius as his successor.[153] The synod of 465 decided that such a marriage denied the cleric further promotion, and that designation of a successor was precluded. Both decisions were accompanied by acclamations, including a number for Hilarus: six '*Exaudi Christe, Vita Hilaro*' for the first decision, five for the second. This portrayal of Hilarus suggests that the editors had a memory of him as a pope who acted

---

et Nestorium vel omnes sequaces eorum et vel hereses, et confirmans dominatorem et principatum sanctae sedis catholicae et apostolicae. Hic fecit constitutum de ecclesia ad sancta Maria.'

[148] *LP* 48.1.

[149] *LP* 47.6.

[150] Hilarus, *Ep*. 15, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, pp. 159-165.

[151] Hilarus, *Ep*. 15.2: 'Quod ut deniceps possit tenacious custodiri, si placet, omnes sententias et subscriptiones proprias commodate, ut synodali judicio aditus illicitis.'

[152] Hilarus, *Ep*. 15.11: "Acceptis quae recitata sunt, de omnibus nunc fratres speciales sententias Deo vobis spirante depromite".

[153] *LP* 57.3-4.

consensually in synod, and possibly in other situations. The respective treatment of the two popes in the text points to a broader editorial argument for clerical engagement in the decision-making process.

This argument is strongly echoed in the account of the Acacian schism in which there is a discernible theme of popes acting with advice. In the lives of the five popes between Simplicius and Hormisdas that carry the account, three show that popes acted with advice, and one makes the point that the pope should have done so. Felix III held a council before sending a *defensor* with the advice of his see (*cum consilio*) to Constantinople.[154] The editors also reported that, in his pontificate, priests and deacons issued a decree *de omnem ecclesiam* after his death, providing a clear example of clerical participation.[155] Gelasius acted 'in pursuance of the acts of a synod' (*sub gesta synodi*) in rehabilitating Misenus.[156] When Hormisdas acted to resolve the schism, it was 'pursuant to a decree of a synod' (*ex constitutum synodi*).[157] Anastasius II caused an internal schism in Rome when he entered into communion with the deacon Photinus of Thessalonica, 'without taking advice (*sine consilio*) from priests, bishops and clerics of the whole catholic church'.[158] The life of Simplicius, pope when Zeno issued the *Henotikon*, contains the discordant comment that he 'dissembled and never sent a reply to Acacius.'[159] However, this is contradicted by an account of the Acacian schism, usually attributed to Gelasius, which states that Simplicius wrote very often (*totiens*).[160] The editors of the *Liber* are silent as to whether Simplicius acted with or without advice but there may be other reasons for his unpopularity with the clergy: he initiated the *scriptura* issued by the praetorian prefect Basilius in 483, which decreed papal elections could not be celebrated without consulting secular authority and forbade electioneering in the dying days of a papacy, a potential opportunity for a windfall for the clergy.[161]

---

[154] *LP* 50.2: 'Felix … mittens defensorem cum consilio sedis suae, facto concilio'.
[155] *LP* 50.5: [In Phase 1]: 'Et post transitum eius factum est a presbiteris et diaconibus constitutum de omnem ecclesiam.'
[156] *LP* 51.2.
[157] *LP* 54.2.
[158] *LP* 52.2: 'multi clerici et presbiteri se a communione ipsius erigerunt, eo quod communicasset sine consilio presbiterorum vel episcoporum vel clericorum cunctae ecclesiae catholicae diacono Thessalonicense, nomine Fotino.'
[159] *LP* 49.4: 'Simplicius dissimulans numquam rescripsit Acacio';
[160] *CA* 99.20 and 23 ('Gesta de nomine Acaci'): 'per ferme triennium vel amplius sanctae memoriae papa Simplicius numquam destitit scribere ad Acacium episcopum, ut fieret de Petro quod Timotheus episcopus postulabat' and 'cum ergo sanctae memoriae papae Simplici nihil totiens ad Acacium ante directa propter Alexandrinae ecclesiae quietem et catholicae integretatem fidei scripta proficerent …' Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum,* pp. 510ff., treats the Gesta as the first of Gelasius's six tracts.
[161] *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae,* DII, para .4, p. 445: 'tamen admonitione beatissimi viri papae nostri Simplicii, quam ante oculos semper habere debemus, hoc nobis meministis sub dei obtestatione fuisse mandatum, ut praeter ullum strepitum et venerabilis ecclesiae detrimentum, si eum de hac luce transire contigerit, non sine nostra consultatione cuiuslibet celebretur electio'.

The report of the double election of 530, when both Boniface II and the deacon Dioscorus were elected and ordained on the same day, presented a variant to the argument for clerical engagement in the decision making, here the election of a pope. The election brought into focus the practice of popes nominating their successors and the issue of external interference in papal elections. Athalaric, the Ostrogothic King, sought to ensure the election of a pope more amenable to accepting Justinian's theopaschite formula. Although Pope Felix IV nominated Boniface in 530, Athalaric and his Roman ministers, including Cassiodorus, engineered the election. Dioscorus, who had advised Hormisdas against accepting the formula as far back as 519, was the clergy's choice. [162] The editors of P2 made no reference to external interference or to the theopaschite formula, although Dioscorus' candidature warrants the assumption that it was at least one of the issues. They were clear, however, on expressing the need for the consent of the majority of the clergy in the matter of the elections. They recorded that, even after his rival's death, no one assented to Boniface's episcopacy, because 'the great majority had been on Dioscorus's side.'[163]

I argue that the editors introduced a further strand in the advocation of consensual leadership in promoting the message, which ran counter to that of Symmachan Apocrypha and the outcome of the Laurentian schism, that popes were accountable. I suggest that the editors promoted this notion despite the fact that the *Liber* is widely considered to be a pro-Symmachan text, and the principle of papal non-justiciability crystallised in the Laurentian schism to Symmachus's advantage. In contrast to narratives in the Apocrypha, in which popes purged themselves when faced with similar charges, the *Liber* reported them as purged by bishops.[164]There is not an exact overlap between the examples in the Apocrypha and those in the *Liber* but there is a consistency of principle in each: four of the Apocrypha assert the principle of non-justiciability;[165] in all the cases in the *Liber* the pope was stated to have been purged by other bishops. Damasus, accused of adultery, was declared purged by a synod of forty-four bishops.[166] Sixtus III, arraigned on an unspecified charge, was stated in the *Liber* to have been purged by a synod of fifty-six bishops; this contrasts with the key statement of the ex-consul Maximus in *Gesta de purgatione Xystii* that 'it is not permitted to pass sentence on the

[162] For a detailed view of the election see Moreau, '*Ipsis diebus Bonifatius'*, pp. 177-198. For Dioscorus's advice, see the *Collectio Avellana, Ep.* 216: 'Suggestio Dioscori Diaconi'.
[163] *LP* 57.2: "Cui tamen in episcopatum nullus subscripsit, dum plurima multitude fuissent cum Dioscoro".
[164] Narratives in the Symmachan Apocrypha expressing this point are the accounts of Popes Marcellinus and Sixtus III. See 'Das Documentum des [X]ystus von Rom' and 'Das Documentum des [M]arcellinus von Rom' in E. Wirbelauer, *Zwei Päpste in Rom: Der Konflict zwischen Laurentius und Symmachus (498-514): Studien und Texte,* Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt, Bd. 16 (Munich, 1993), pp. 262-71 and 284-301.
[165] These four texts are the *Gesta de Xysti purgatione* and the *Gesta Polychronii episcopi Hierosolynitani*, the *Sinuessanae synodi gesta de Marcellino* and the *Constitutum Silvestri* or the Council of 284 Bishops — *Zwei Päpste,* pp. 262-301 and 308-15.
[166] *LP* 39.3: 'et facto synodo purgatur a XLIIII episcopis'.

pontiff.'[167] In the editors' account, Symmachus was purged by a synod, although this contradicted the record of the actual Roman synod which discussed his position in 501 and decided that they could not judge him: 'since the appeals of all bishops are referred to him ... what is to be done?'[168] The editors further claimed that he was re-instated by all the bishops, priests, deacons, all the clergy and the people.[169] The account of the synod in Rome that decided that Boniface II had acted 'against the canons' shows the pope accountable to the clergy in synod: the attendees made the decision, which the pope then acknowledged.[170] Cumulatively, these examples asserted papal accountability which, I suggest, was presented as a corollary to the requirement the bishop should act consensually.

A Petrine Mandate for the Clergy

The editors of P3 also contrived to claim a Petrine mandate for the clergy by adapting the content of the apocryphal letter of Clement to James to suggest that Peter had inaugurated the papal administration. Above I showed that the editors converted the apocryphal author's account of the transmission of the chair of Peter's preaching and teaching (*praedicationis et doctrinae cathedram*) into that of the Church (*ecclesia).* I consider that the editors made another change and a different claim. The author of the letter reported Peter's instruction to Clement not to become too involved in affairs of business: 'It becomes you, living without reproach … to shake off all the cares of life, being neither a provider of surety, nor an advocate, nor involved in business. Christ does not wish you to be a judge, or arbitrator of business matters, in case, preoccupied with the affairs of men, you are not able to have the time to separate good men from bad according to the principle of truth.' [171] I suggest it is clear from the occupations mentioned that the distinction, contemplated by the author, was between secular business affairs and papal ministry within the Church. While the Latin is not totally straightforward, the author envisaged that laymen did the other duties: 'let those learning, that

[167] *LP* 46.1: 'et facto convento cum magna examinatione iudicium synodicum purgatur a LVI episcopis'; *Zwei Päpste,* Das Documentum des [X]ystus, p. 268: 'non licet enim adversus pontificem dare sententiam'.
[168] *LP* 53.4: 'facto synodo purgatur a crimine falso'; *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae,* 'Relatio episcoporum ad regem', para. 10, p. 423: 'quoniam ipsi per canones appellationes omnium episcoporum commissae sunt, et cum ispe appellat, quid erit faciendum?'
[169] *LP* 53.4: 'ab omnibus episcopis et presbiteris et diaconibus et omni clero vel plebe reintegratur'.
[170] *LP* 57.4: 'factum iterum synodum hoc censuerunt sacerdotes omnes propter reverentiam sedis sanctae et quia contra canones fuerat hoc factum et quia culpa eum respiciebat ut successorem sibi constituere; ipse Bonifacius papa reum se confessus est'. '*Sacerdotes'* were bishops and/or priests, or even clergy — Davis, *The Book of the Pontiffs,* Glossary, p. 124.
[171] *Epistula Clementis*, *Die Pseudoklementinen,* 5. 2 and 5.3: 'te quidem oportet in reprehensibiliter vivere et summon niti, ut ommes vitae huius occupations anicias, ne fideiussor existas, ne advocatus litium fias … neque enim iudicem aut cognitorem sarcularium negotiorum hodie te ordinare vult Christus, uti ne praefocatus praesentibus hominum curis no possis verbo deo vacare et secundum veritatis regulam secernere bonos a malis'.

is laymen, in their turns produce those works, which we have shown above to be congenial to you, and let no one detain you from those endeavours through which health is given to all.'[172]

The editors of P3 transformed this distinction between the papal ministry and secular affairs into one between pope and the papal administration, and effectively claimed a Petrine origin for the latter. After stating Peter's commission to Clement to govern the Church, the text of the *Liber* continues 'in order that, ordaining the managers of different cases through whom the church's affairs are despatched, you may find [yourself] very little involved in the cares of the world; but ensure that you are completely free for prayer and preaching to the people.'[173] The distinction here is not between the papal ministry and secular matters and laity, as in Clement's letter; it is an internal division within the Church between prayer and preaching on the one hand and church affairs (*actus ecclesiasticus*) and ordained persons (*ordinans …*) on the other. I consider the provision for managers (*dispositores diversarum causarum*) in the expansion on Peter's mandate to Clement is important. I suggest that the editors of P3, who had already altered the wording of Clement's letter to James, made this further amendment which had the intended effect of tracing back to Peter the origin of the papal administration.

This notion of a separation of the functions of the Roman Church may have owed something to the example of Bishop Caesarius of Arles (502-42), who distanced himself from his local church's extensive landholdings by assigning their day to day management to subordinates. [174] Caesarius was heavily influenced by Julianus Pomerius, who in *De vita contemplativa* argued that bishops should detach themselves from secular entanglements.[175] Caesarius had regular contact with the papacy: he had good relations with Pope Symmachus who made him papal vicar in Gaul; he visited Rome in 512; he requested Pope Hormisdas (514-23)'s approval for a donation to his own foundation that was funded by a sale of church lands, and he later (between 526 and 535) sought popes' confirmations of local regional councils' decisions.[176] It seems likely that members of the Roman Church were familiar with ecclesiastical arrangements in Arles, and it is possible that the editors of the *Liber* saw a use for the distinction between preaching and 'ecclesiastical affairs' in Rome.

The editors' willingness to promote the authority of their bishop on the condition that he exercised it with their consent reflects a common feature in institutional behaviour, the assertion of individual or collective self-interest by its members. I consider that the editors'

---

[172] Epistula Clementis, *Die Pseudoklementinen,* 5.4: 'namque opera quae tibi minus congruere superius exposuimus. Exhibeant sibi invicem discentes, id est laici'.
[173] *LP* 1.5: 'ut ordinans dispositores diversarum causarum, per quos actus ecclesiasticus profligetur, et tu minime in curis saeculi deditus repperiaris; sed solummodo ad orationem et praedicare populo vacare stude'.
[174] See W.E. Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, Fourth Series, no. 22 (Cambridge, 1994), p. 89.
[175] Klingshirn,, *Caesarius of Arles*, pp. 75-82.
[176] Klingshirn,, *Caesarius of Arles*, pp. 127-45.

strategy is echoed, if not exactly paralleled, in an account of contemporary institution by John Lydus. His *On Powers, Or the Magistracies of the Roman State,* probably composed between 554 and 565, is ostensibly a history of Roman magistracies and offices, but it is also in large measure an account of John's career in the eastern prefecture.[177] Chris Kelly observes that *On Powers* mirrored the continual and often delicate process of negotiation between personal interest and corporate benefit, crucial to a successful career'.[178] I suggest that the editors' actions also exemplify the findings of the Rational Choice theorists, who argue that institutions as governance or rule systems that they represent are deliberately constructed edifices established by individuals seeking to promote or protect their interests, and that individuals may conclude that collective action is the best way of achieving their goals.[179] I suggest that in seeking to ensure that popes operated with agreement, that they were accountable and in asserting a Petrine mandate for the administration, the editors were pursuing that self-interest.

Section 4 Church-Secular Ruler Relations

I argue that three narratives in the *Liber Pontificalis* show that a fourth discernible editorial agenda was to re-define, or re-express the relationship between the Roman Church and secular rulers. First, in their accounts of the councils of Nicea and Chalcedon the editors portrayed popes as the main actors and emperors in a supporting position, implying that these were the appropriate roles. Second, the editors of P2 detailed the emperor Constantine's church constructions, endowments and donations in the life of Pope Silvester, the purpose of which, I consider was to encourage further imperial patronage. Third, by the selective attachment of the term '*hereticus*' to accounts of the actions of the Ostrogothic king Theoderic, the editors sketched out what actions they considered acceptable and unacceptable, particularly in relation to the involvement of secular rulers in disputed papal elections. While in the first of the narratives, the editors were also promoting papal authority, I think there is sufficient reason to group the accounts with the other two examples as collectively they show a desire to define the Church's relationship with secular rulers.

Popes, Emperors and Ecumenical Councils

In their accounts of the councils of Nicea and Chalcedon the editors expressed different and more subordinate roles for emperors at ecumenical councils than the historical record supports.

[177] *Ioannes Lydus, On Powers, Or the Magistracies of the Roman State* (De Magistratibus Reipublicae Romanae), ed. by A.C. Bandy (Philadelphia, 1983).
[178] C. Kelly, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire,* Revealing Antiquity no. 15 (Cambridge MA, 2004), p. 51.
[179] See Chapter 1, page 23.

Emperors summoned all four ecumenical councils between 325 and 451. Constantine summoned the Council of Nicea, acted as its president and his theological adviser, Ossius of Cordova, was the first signatory to its acts.[180] The emperor Marcian decided on the Council of Chalcedon and the evidence suggests that he and the empress Pulcheria took the key decisions, and the bishops met subsequently to deliver the appropriate approval.[181] In contrast to this reality, the *Liber* records that Nicea was summoned at Silvester's command (*cum eius praeceptum*), that Chalcedon was summoned at Leo's instigation (*sui auctoritate*), and it states that at the latter the emperor Marcian and the empress Pulcheria made confessions of faith before the bishops after setting aside their royal status (*deposita regia maiestate*). Then, 'after expounding their faith with their own signatures the emperor Marcian and his wife the empress Pulcheria demanded that the holy council send it to the very blessed Pope Leo, in condemnation of all heresies.'[182] Both accounts attempt to attribute responsibility and credit for the councils to popes, and that of Chalcedon seems to reflect how the editors wished the council had played out. Claire Sotinel points to five competing authorities at play in the Three Chapters Controversy (the emperor, the bishop of Rome, the ecumenical council, bishops, and clerics as experts), the last two of whom only emerged as a force in the 550s.[183] I suggest that the respective status of the other three was less clear in the 530s. While the editors no doubt wished to assert the authority of the pope, I suggest that, in their depiction of Chalcedon, they also sought to propose and sketch out an ideal, subordinate role for emperors. I consider that this to be one of three such suggested roles that appear in the first edition of the *Liber*.

Imperial Patronage

On the second point, I argue that the listing of all Constantine's benefactions in the life of Silvester in P2 was intended to elicit Justinian's patronage. P1 is virtually devoid of information on imperial patronage, as the editors focused on promoting the authority of the pope. Following the format established in P1 for Popes Sixtus III, Hilarus and Symmachus (details of constructions, endowments, gifts of liturgical vessels and furnishings), the life of Silvester contains details of all Constantine's constructions and donations. Quantitively, the details are the most significant in the first edition and, arguably, dominate it, which begs the questions why were they included, and why in P2? The agenda of the editors of P2 was wider ranging and, I suggest, circumstances may have prompted consideration of imperial patronage.

[180] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, pp. 57 and 62.
[181] M. Whitby, 'An Unholy Crew? Bishops Behaving Badly at Church Councils' in R. Price and M. Whitby (eds.), *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400-700* (Liverpool, 2011), p. 182.
[182] *LP* 47.4: 'Et iterum fidem suam imperator Marcianus Augustus cum coniugem suam Pulcheriam Augustam, cyrografo proprio fidem suam exponents, postulaverunt sanctum Concilium ut dirigeret ad beatissimim Leonem, damnantes omnes hereses.'
[183] C. Sotinel, 'Council, Emperor and Bishops: Authority and Orthodoxy in the Three Chapters controversy' in C. Sotinel, *Church and Society in Late Antique Italy and Beyond* (Aldershot, 2010), V, pp. 13.

In 476, the Roman Church lost its main patrons. As I discuss in Chapter 4, western emperors were not replaced to any significant degree by Odoacer, the Ostrogothic kings or eastern emperors, and gifts received from secular rulers after 476 were modest, even if of diplomatic significance.[184] P2 was probably composed around 535, at the time Justinian was contemplating the reconquest of the western provinces and was engaging in significant building in Constantinople and the East. Notable among his constructions were SS. Sergius and Bacchus (started in 527, completed in 536) and the Hagia Sophia (from after Nika Riots in 532 to December 537), both in Constantinople.[185] I suggest that, given the scale of Justinian's buildings in Constantinople, the East and North Africa, the Roman Church had some expectation of patronage, and that the editors of P2 intended the list of Constantine's donations to be a 'mirror' to encourage more of the same from Justinian.

Adjudicating Contested Papal Elections

I consider that third attempt to model secular rulers' behaviour is apparent in the cameo of Theoderic the Great (493-526) in which the editors of P2 showed that there was a role for secular rulers adjudicating disputed papal elections, provided they did so in a way that was acceptable to members of the Church. The editors present the king both positively and negatively, and there is a clear point at which his designation changes from *rex* to *hereticus rex*.[186] It becomes negative in the life of John I, whom Theoderic sent to Constantinople to argue for the restoration of churches to the Arian community in the East. Theoderic starts as *rex,* but at the point he threatened to put the whole of Italy to the sword if Justinian consecrated Arian churches for orthodox use, he becomes *rex hereticus*, and is consistently so thereafter. Prior to that, the editors appear to have had no problem with the Arian king deciding between Symmachus and Laurence during the Laurentian schism. They state, with apparent approval, that in opting for the former Theoderic made 'the fair decision' as he reasoned that Symmachus was ordained first and had the greater support.[187] Notably, the editors did not re-write the account to reflect Theoderic's later reputation, suggesting that they set out to show what was acceptable and unacceptable engagement. As I argue in Chapter 3, the Church had a constitutional problem in that it had no mechanism for dealing with double elections. I suggest that in their account of the Laurentian schism the editors flagged up a role for secular rulers on this difficult issue as long as they gave effect to the clergy's choice.

---

[184] See Chapter 4, pp 133-36.
[185] In building churches Justinian devoted particular attention to sites with a longstanding Christian tradition: Constantinople, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Mt. Sinai, Antioch, and Ephesus. See J.D. Alchermes, 'Art and Architecture in the Age of Justinian' in M. Maas (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 355-66.
[186] *LP* 55.1: 'Hic vocitus a rege Theodorico'; *LP* 55.2: 'Pro hanc causam hereticus rex Theodoricus audiens hoc exarsit et voluit totam Italiam ad gladio extinguere.'
[187] *LP* 53.2: 'Qui dum ambo introissent Ravennam, hoc iudicium aequitatis invenit, it qui prior ordinatus fuisset vel ubi pars maxima cognosceretur, ipse sederet in sedem apostolicam.'

These three messages in the text point to a recognition by the editors that emperors, and even an Arian secular ruler, had a role to play in the Church. The first example attempted to modify an existing role in the wider church, the other two more directly concerned the Church in Rome. I suggest that the accounts of Nicea and Chalcedon should be read as attempting to change the respective roles of popes and emperors and popes in ecumenical councils. I consider that the inclusion of Constantine's donations should be seen in the contexts of the loss of imperial patronage after 476 and the imminent arrival of Justinian's troops in Rome. I suggest that we should not underestimate contemporary concerns regarding contested papal elections: as I show in Chapter 3, the compiler of the *Collectio Avellana* included a selection of letters, part of an entire section on Church-Empire relations, to sketch the paradigm of an emperor's involvement in double elections.[188]

Section 5 Writers and Audience

Despite the considerable attention that has been paid to the *Liber Pontificalis* the authors have not been identified and there is some debate as to the initial target audience. There is a broad consensus that the editors were members of the Roman Church and that, even if the *Liber* had not been commissioned by the bishop, it was quickly adopted as an official record. The clerical agenda, which I identify, would strongly argue that the authors came from a level below the pope, and that they represented a broad constituency within the clergy. That background did not preclude them from having strategic awareness or from being concerned about the current state and future direction of their institution. I consider that awareness is apparent in their promotion of the bishop's and the Church's authority and in their identification of the institution's deficiencies. One needs only to consider the case of John Lydus, whose *On Powers* displays a fine awareness of the external or 'macro' factors which affected his institution, and who negotiated the delicate balance between personal interest and corporate benefit, to appreciate that a similar assessment of the editors is highly credible.[189] I have proceeded on the basis of three sets of compilers, one set for each editorial phase, when there may only have been one for each, and the one author may have written both P2 and P3. P1 and P2 appear sufficiently different to point to separate authors for each. I have no reason to dispute Geertman's assessment that P3 was written shortly after and was a retouching of P2.

I suggest that the initial target audience for the *Liber Pontificalis* was members of the Roman Church, although it is possible that, as the text went through successive editorial phases and

[188] See Chapter 3, pp. 106-107.
[189] Kelly, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire*, p.51.

continuations, editors sought to reach a wider readership or came to appreciate that it had one. Much of the content of the first edition (the ordinary decrees in P1, the double elections in P2, the clerical agenda) would probably have meant little, if anything, to an external readership. On the other hand, the emphasis on doctrinal primacy and what the text had to say about Church-Empire relations might suggest a target audience outside the Roman Church. However, the form in which arguments appear in the text does not suggest that they could be presented to theologically sophisticated churchmen in the East or in the West. Deliyannis argues that the *Liber* may have formed part of the background preparation for Hormisdas's embassies to Constantinople in 516 or 518 and the delegates may have taken a copy with them.[190] She proposes the existence of a papal history circulating in Constantinople in 518/19. Her argument is founded on Duchesne's chronology and she relies heavily on his later suggestion that a version of the *Liber* in may have existence in c. 514 or earlier.[191] However, one has to question what a version of the *Liber* would look like at that time. If one had existed, it would probably have been similar to the Liberian Catalogue, the Laurentian Fragment or at best P1, none of which would have assisted the purpose she suggests.

I consider that the considerable emphasis in the *Liber* on Rome's orthodoxy and doctrinal primacy should not detract from the argument that the initial target audience was the members of the Roman Church. I argue that doctrinal primacy was fundamental to the identity of the Church, especially after Chalcedon when it was beginning to assert that primacy, and even more after 482 when the Church's position was challenged by eastern emperors. The articulation of different expressions of primacy, across the three editorial phases of the first edition would, I suggest, have been directly relevant to the Roman clergy. They would have explained to the clergy the varying positions of the Roman Church in its difficult engagement with Constantinople. The claim that Peter was the source of all gospels was unlikely to have been well received in the East, but it may have worked for the Roman clergy as a figurative representation of the claim to doctrinal primacy.

I do not think that the Church-Empire elements mean that rulers had to be included in the target audience. For instance, my argument about Constantine's benefactions does not necessarily mean that Justinian was a target reader. The *Liber* may also have functioned as a record of donations, in which case, I suggest, it would have been sufficient for the emperor to know that his gifts were appropriately recorded in the institutional history. The mixed portrayal of Theoderic may also have been an acknowledgement, intended to be shared by an internal

[190] Deliyannis, 'The Roman *Liber Pontificalis*', pp.14-15.
[191] L. Duchesne, *Étude sur le Liber Pontificalis*, (Paris, 1877), pp.190-92, quoted by Deliyannis, 'The Roman *Liber Pontificalis*', p. 6.

audience, that when it came to disputed papal elections, the secular ruler, of whatever religious hue, had a role to play.

Conclusion

In this chapter I argue that the first edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* needs to be understood in the context of the double challenges posed by the events of 476 and 482. After 476 the structure within which the Roman Church operated changed: it was no longer directly supported by an emperor. In P1 we see that the editors responded by promoting the authority of their bishop in a way that was anticipated by the Synods of Rome of 501 and 502. On those earlier occasions, historic events rather than editorial constructions, bishops and clergy (some members of the Roman Church, some not) reacted to an instruction to judge Pope Symmachus by asserting the principle of papal non-justiciability. I suggest that this reflects the fact that, as articulated by Avitus of Vienne, that the bishop of Rome performed roles that others had an interest in maintaining. In the new less structured and less supportive environment the authors of the *Liber* responded by upholding the authority of their bishop of Rome. There is a considerable gap in time between the event of 476 and the dates when the *Liber* was compiled. However, I suggest it would have taken time for a full appreciation of the impact of the consequences of the demise of western emperors to emerge, and we should not be too surprised at a long gestation period.

The fact that the *Liber* was a response to the challenges posed by Zeno's *Henotikon* and Justinian's attempt to impose the theopaschite formula is, I suggest, much clearer. The emphasis on doctrinal primacy in all three editorial phases is significant. The challenge did not end with Pope Hormisdas's apparent success at the end of the Acacian schism: almost immediately Justinian started to press for the acceptance of the theopaschite formula. I suggest that the emphasis on doctrinal primacy that we see in the *Liber* reflects the editors' acute awareness of the importance of the Roman Church's record of orthodoxy and its position on doctrinal primacy to its identity. After 476, deprived of imperial support, the Church and the editors fell back on components of authority and arguments that could have traction: the Church had an immaculate record and it was the *sedes apostolica.* I argue in this thesis that doctrinal primacy was fundamental to the Church's identity, its authority and its power. The emphasis on it in the *Liber* is traceable directly to the *Henotikon.*

The analysis and explanation that I present in this chapter is at some variance to that of Rosamond McKitterick, who has written authoritatively and at length on the *Liber Pontificalis* in recent years. Her latest major work on the text was published in the final stages of my

completing this thesis.[192] There is much in the book with which I agree. For instance, she says of the seventh-century Lives that there is a consistent emphasis in 'the definition and upholding of orthodox Christian doctrine in the face of heretical ideas emanating from the emperor and the patriarch in Constantinople'.[193] I consider that statement to be consistent with my arguments in this chapter. However, she continues to present a very different analysis of the first edition. I do not subscribe to the view that the original editors and the continuators necessarily had the same objectives, but in reality, those of those of the sixth and seventh centuries were similar. There remain three key points on which I differ in regard to the earlier period.

First, I do not agree that the *Liber Pontificalis* 'should be seen as a specifically papal and Roman response to the political crisis engulfing the whole of Italy' in 536.[194] As I argue in this chapter, it was a response to the double events of 476 and 482. Her focus on the Church in Rome and the ambitions of the authors for the bishop of Rome ignores or overrides, in my view, the impact of the exogenous shocks to the institution that were brought about by the events that took place at the start of the period.

Second, I disagree that the *Liber Pontificalis* was designed 'to construct the popes as rulers of Rome, replacing the emperors'.[195] In her earlier articles, she asserted this position mainly by arguing that the structure of the text followed that of serial biographies of Roman emperors (those of Suetonius and the *Historia Augusta*).[196] In her latest publication she addresses the issue of 'imperial emulation', arguing that the architectural styles of the Roman Church provided a material counterpart for the textual replacement of emperors with popes.[197] She also argues that the attention paid to Roman liturgy 'reinforced the theme of imperial emulation and substitution, for the emperor's devotion to religious matters had been a central aspect of the public role of the emperor as portrayed in the biographies of Suetonius and the *Historia Augusta'*.[198] I recognise that there are elements of isomorphic authority in the *Liber Pontificalis*, especially in relation to the construction of churches. However, I suggest it can be overstated, particularly in regard to the period leading up to 536. McKitterick appears to privilege the secular intellectual tradition over the ecclesiastical and religious one. I suggest that we see in the first edition the writers reaching deeply into their religious and ecclesiastical

[192] R. McKitterick, *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy: The* Liber Pontificalis, James C. Lydon Lectures (Cambridge, 2020) was published in June 2020.
[193] McKitterick, *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy,* p.14.
[194] McKitterick, 'Roman Texts and Roman History', p. 23 and *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy*, p. 32.
[195] McKitterick, 'The representation of Old Saint Peter's', p. 96.
[196] McKitterick, 'Roman Texts and Roman History', pp. 23-24 and 29-33.
[197] McKitterick, *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy,* p. 125-31 and 'The popes as rulers of Rome in the Aftermath of Empire, 476-69' in S.J. Brown, C. Methuen and A. Spicer (eds.), *The Church and Empire,* Studies in Church History, vol. 54 (Cambridge, 2018), p. 87.
[198] McKitterick, *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy*, p. 144.

heritage. I consider that the structure of the *Liber* is based on the episcopal list that Irenaeus used to underpin the notion of the apostolic tradition. In their statements that popes issued decrees *de* (*omne*) *ecclesia*, the editors called on an awareness of ecclesiastical history which they assumed was shared by the reader, and which only had meaning in a Church context. In addition, the suggestions in the text for Church-secular relations would seem to belie the notion that bishops of the time (say, up to c.540) had aspirations of secular rule in the city.

Third, I do not agree that the *Liber Pontificalis* is a Christianised history of Rome; if it is a history, it is one of the Roman Church. McKitterick's focus is on the city. She argues that the first edition of the *Liber* sought to frame a new identity for Christians within a narrative of transforming Rome from a pagan to a Christian city.[199] She suggests that it records the topographical transformation of Rome into a Christian city. I present a different view in this chapter. I consider that the *Liber* is best understood as an institutional document: part history, part polemic. I argue that it was a response to two institutional challenges, the exogenous shocks that occurred at the beginning of the period. The objectives and arguments that I identify are institutional and ecclesiastical in their nature. The defence of the Church's doctrinal primacy was a recognition of its importance to the institution's identity. The clerical agenda that I identify points to an internal purpose. The suggestions for Church-secular ruler relations imply neither an agenda of independence, nor an ambition for secular rule; rather, they infer an understanding of the Roman Church as an institution that operated in a society ruled over by a secular authority.

This chapter suggests a different explanation of the development of to Church to those who seek to understand its rise and that of the bishop to a position of dominance in Rome. It suggests that more needs to be understood about how the Church responded as an institution and about the challenges it had to face rather than assume that it welcomed independence. Institutions have their own dynamics and they usually operate to reproduce themselves and ensure their survival, and individual members seek to make them work to serve their own interests. The clerical agenda which I identify points to a developing, if difficult, maturity, and a need to appreciate the tensions within the Roman Church and how they were managed.

[199] McKitterick, *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy*, pp.65-66.

CHAPTER 3

The *Collectio Avellana*: The Defence of a Pope, Papal Authority and the Re-working of Church-Empire Relations

The *Collectio Avellana* is a sixth-century compilation of mainly papal letters and other documents which has puzzled historians for a considerable period of time.[1] It was probably compiled by a cleric shortly after the date on which its latest document, Pope Vigilius's First *Constitutum,* was submitted to the Second Council of Constantinople in May 553 in defence of the Three Chapters. There is no record of what happened to the text before two copies were made in a monastery near Gubbio, in central Italy, in the eleventh century. The letters in the *Collectio* cover 186 years (367-553) and are collated in five or six discrete small collections or dossiers. Two of the dossiers address disputed papal elections in the fourth and fifth centuries; the largest dossier contains letters to and from Pope Hormisdas (514-23) concerning the settlement of the Acacian schism. Historians have struggled to determine an overarching purpose to the collection. Otto Günther, its nineteenth-century editor, considered it to be a collection of dossiers that had not been collated elsewhere. In the last 15 years it has attracted considerable scholarly attention. An exercise, led by the University or Perugia, has attempted to understand it in the context of fifth- and sixth-century canonical collections. However, to date no one has satisfactorily identified its purpose.

In this chapter I argue that the *Collectio* is a late antique letter collection and should be read as such. Once this hermeneutical key is applied, it becomes apparent that the compiler had three objectives. First, he sought to defend the reputation of Pope Vigilius and/or the position that the First *Constitutum* represented. Second, he set out to track and to assert new expressions of doctrinal and jurisdictional primacy which emerged during and after the Acacian schism (484-519). Third, he intended the collection to opine on Church/Empire relations: he argued strongly against the emperor's involvement in doctrinal issues but set out a role for the ruler in the Church. The *Collectio* has the characteristics of two sub-genres of letters collections: it was an episcopal letter collection in that it sought to defend the reputation of a bishop; it was a papal one in that it sought to enhance the position of the bishop of Rome. I also argue that the *Collectio* was a polemical document which circulated among the clergy of the Roman Church for a period of thirty years or so (c.556-c.587) after the Council of Constantinople and before

[1] O. Günther (ed.), *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab a.CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collection,* Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum no. 35, 2 vols. (Vienna 1895-98).

Gregory I categorically accepted the Council's condemnation of the Three Chapters. As such, the collection gives an insight into a division in the Church and the means by which the debate was conducted.

The Collectio Avellana: *Manuscripts and Otto Günther's Edition*

The *Collectio Avellana* comprises 244 or so letters and other documents, dating from the fourth to the sixth century, mainly letters written by or to popes, but also by or to emperors, magistrates, bishops, priests and synods. The collection is known to us through two eleventh-century parchment codices, Vat. Lat. 3787 and Vat. Lat. 4961, and nine fifteenth- to seventeenth-century paper codices. The provenance of Vat. Lat. 3787 is not known; that of Vat. Lat 4961 is well established and it gave its name to collection. A note written in the fourteenth century on the last folio of the codex, '*hunc librum adquisivit dom[in]us Damianus S.*', indicates that it arrived in the monastery of the Holy Cross of Fons Avellana while Peter Damian was abbot, so in the period 1043-58. In the eighteenth century the Ballerini brothers considered it the more famous and the older manuscript, and attributed to it the name '*Avellana*'.[2] It is probable that the manuscript was written not long before its arrival in the monastery.[3] It remained there for some four hundred years before being given to Henricus Norisius, a steward of the church of Eugubina (today, Gubbio), the diocese in which the monastery fell. As on the front cover the words *Emptum ex libris Cardinalis Sirleti* are written, we may reasonably assume it was acquired by the Cardinal Sirleto, the Vatican Librarian (1570-85), on a private basis. After his death in 1585 it probably passed to the Vatican library.[4] At the end of the sixteenth century Cardinal Carafa, Sirleto's successor as Librarian, utilised 190 letters from the *Avellana* codex to compile a first tome of decretal letters of the greatest pontiffs, while Cardinal Baronius (Librarian 1597-1607) used a large part of the letters unused by Carafa for his ecclesiastical annals. This pattern of selective use or editing was repeated in later centuries for both conciliar and papal letter collections, although several historians including Friedrich Maassen, William Meyer and Paul Ewald, and Otto Günther looked at the collection in its entirety.[5]

The 244 letters cover 186 years but most of them are concentrated in relatively short time-frames. The first letter, an account of the double election of Damasus and Ursinus, may be dated no earlier than 367; the most recent is Pope Vigilius's First *Constitutum* which he addressed to the emperor Justinian in May 553, when the Second Council of Constantinople was about to condemn the Three Chapters. Maassen first classified the letters into six different groups on the basis of their content: first, letters on the double election of Damasus and Ursinus

[2] O. Günter, *Collectio Avellana, Prolegomena,* pp. xviii-xx.
[3] *Prolegomena*, p. xxiii.
[4] *Prolegomena*, pp. xxiii-xxv.
[5] *Prolegomena*, pp. i-ii and xviii-xx.

in 366-7 (*CA* 1-13); second, the same of Boniface I and Eulalius in 418-19 (*CA* 14-37); third, three letters of emperors and ten of two popes (Innocent I and Zosimus) on the history of Pelagianism (*CA* 38-50); fourth, 28 letters relating to the monophysite heresy in the churches of Alexander and Antioch in the time of Timothy Aelurus (bishop 457), Peter Mongos (bishop 477) and Peter the Fuller (bishop 469-71, 476, 485-88) (*CA* 51-78); fifth, letters relating to the Acacian schism and Pelagianism, mainly in the pontificate of Gelasius I (492-96), with one letter of Symmachus dated 512 (*CA* 79-104); sixth, letters from the pontificate of Hormisdas (514-23)(*CA* 105-243). Maassen observed that the fifth group was divided by twelve letters (*CA* 82-93) on dogmatic issues from the reigns of John II, Agapetus and Vigilius (534-53) but he did not treat them as a separate group. Maassen's work was not a full edition.[6]

Otto Günther comprehensively edited the *Collectio* in the 1890s. He established on palaeographical grounds, and against most prevailing opinion, that both Vat. Lat. 3787 and Vat. Lat. 4961 were copied in the eleventh century, and that the former (which he denoted as 'V') was the older, and that the '*Avellana*' (denoted as 'codex α') had been transcribed from V.[7] His deduction of the age order was based mainly on how the two sets of eleventh-century copyists (nine in the case of V, four who produced codex α) handled abbreviated words in their allocated quaternions.[8] Although Günther identified some differences between the two eleventh-century manuscripts, they are not material for the purposes of this chapter. His analysis of the collection was mainly based on Vat. Lat. 3787 but the title of his edition remained the *Collectio Avellana*. He considered that the *Collectio* comprised five small collections or *collectiunculae*, that it had been collated soon after the most recent document (May 553) and that, with one exception, the content of the *Collectio* of the eleventh-century manuscripts was the same as that collated in the mid-sixth century.

In contrast to Maassen, Günther grouped the letters mainly on the basis of their archival origin. He considered the source of the first group (*CA* 1-40), relating mainly to the double elections of 366 -67 and 418-19, was the archive of the prefect of the city of Rome.[9] He attributed the second group (*CA* 41-50 relating to the history of Pelagianism in 417-8) to the *scrinium* of the Church of Carthage.[10] His third group (*CA* 51-55) comprises five letters of Leo I which were only to be found in the *Collectio.* He does not suggest an origin for these but the papal archive was the most likely.[11] The fourth group (*CA* 56-104) concerns ecclesiastical affairs in the reigns of Popes Simplicius, Felix III, Gelasius and Symmachus (from 476 to 496 with Symmachus's

[6] Summarised by Günther in *Avellana-Studien,* Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Classe, Bd 134 (Vienna,1896), pp. 2-3.
[7] Günther acknowledged that William Meyer had first concluded that codex V could not have been copied from codex α. *Prolegomena,* p. xx.
[8] *Prolegomena,* pp. xiiii-xxii.
[9] Günther, *Avellana-Studien,* pp. 3-19; Blair-Dixon, 'Memory and authority', p. 62.
[10] Günther, *Avellana-Studien,* pp. 19-27; Blair-Dixon, 'Memory and authority', p. 62.
[11] Günther, *Avellana-Studien,* pp. 27.

letter of October 512 being an outlier). Günther noted that *CA* 82-93, the twelve documents from the later pontificates, had been inserted into this group by chance but, like Maassen, he did not treat them as a separate small group. His fifth *collectiuncula* (*CA* 105-243) comprises some 138 items of correspondence from the pontificate of Pope Hormisdas (514-23). He considered the papal archive a likely source for some of these small collections.[12] He suggested that letter from Epiphanius of Constantinople to Diodorus of Tyre about twelve gems (*CA* 244) did not belong to the original collection, and would have been added at a later date. [13]

Table 3.1 Günther's *Collectiunculae*

Letters	Dates	Content	Archive
1-40	366-67 and 418-19	Double elections of Damasus and Ursinus and Boniface and Eulalius	Prefecture of the city of Rome
41-50	417-18	History of Pelagius	*Scrinium* of Bishop Aurelius of Carthage
51-55	June and August 460	5 Letters of Leo I	Probably the papal archive
56-81 & 94-104	476-495 and 512	Letters of Simplicius, Felix III, Gelasius, Symmachus.	Probably the papal archive
82-93	534-53	Letters of John II, Agapetus and Vigilius	Probably the papal archive
105-243	514-23	Letters, etc, relating to the settlement of the Acacian schism	Probably the papal archive
244	Unknown	Epiphanius on the 12 Gems	Later addition; source uncertain.

Günther considered that the overarching purpose of the *Collectio* was to gather documents not collated elsewhere. He established that some 200 letters would not have survived but for their inclusion in the collection, either because they only appear in it or because it was a resource for other codices.[14] While he thought that the collection was far from miscellaneous, he could not attach any public purpose to it: he noted that, unlike the codices of Dionysius Exiguus, the *Collectio* was 'not complete and not compiled for the use of all', and 'evidence is not wanting, by which it seems clear that [the *Collectio*] is nothing other than a certain wood and matter of history, scraped together by I know not whom, and only intended in this form for private use'.[15]

[12] Günther, *Avellana-Studien*, p. 66; A. Evers, 'The *Collectio Avellana*: An 'Eccentric' Canonical Collection?' in R. Lizzi Testa (ed.), *La* Collectio Avellana *fra Tardoantico e Alto Medioevo*, *Cristianesimo nella storia*, 39(1) (2018), p. 80 and n. 29.
[13] *Prolegomena*, p. iii.
[14] On the 45 or so letters that appear elsewhere see *Prolegomena*, Chapter 3, pp. lv-lxxxix
[15] *Prolegomena*, p. ii: 'observandum tamen Avellanam non esse collectionem ex omni parte perfectam atque ut exempli causa collectionem decretalium Dionysii Exigui in omnium usum compositam atque evulgatam;' and 'immo non desunt vestigia, quibus elucere videtur eam nihil esse nisi silvam quandam

Historiography

Until recently, the historiography of the *Collectio Avellana* was relatively limited for such a potentially significant text. Two recent developments, a conscious focus on the *Collectio* and the new scholarship on letter collections, are offering new insights and a potentially a new way of interpreting the collection. A meeting of scholars at the International Conference on Patristic Studies in 2007 ignited an interest in the *Collectio,* with an initial aspiration for a translation and commentary.[16] Two international conferences in Rome followed.[17] Separately, the University of Perugia, under the leadership of Rita Lizzi Testa, set up a research project on fifth- and sixth-century canonical collections, and in September 2016 sponsored a seminar, the results of which are in two publications.[18] Almost contemporaneously, new scholarship on ancient and late antique letter collections has emerged, largely prompted by a seminal article by Roy Gibson in 2012.[19] This new wave of interest has addressed some of the same questions tackled by Günther: is the *Collectio* an integrated text or a collation of smaller ones, were some of the *collectiunculae* or dossiers added later, and was there was an overarching objective? It had also added new ones: what prompted the compilation of the *Collectio,* and is the collection intrinsically one of canons or of late antique letters?

Most historians have struggled to see the *Collectio* as an integrated text. For Blair-Dixon the negative portrayal of Pope Damasus, considered then and today a promoter of papal authority, defied the internal logic of the text which supported bishops who maintained Roman sovereignty in the face of imperial intervention.[20] Dana Juliana Viezure sees not only the accounts of the double elections but also *CA* 82-93 (the later letters of John II, Agapetus and Vigilius) as challenges to a unified discourse or interpretation; she argues that the latter were a later addition. Like Blair-Dixon, she also struggles with the depiction of Damasus which, she considers, strays from the *Collectio's* purpose of showing a strong unchallenged papacy.[21]

---

ac materiam historiae a nescio quo corrasam atque sub hac quidem forma non nisi privatis usibus destinam'.

[16] R. Lizzi Testa, opening speech of University of Perugia conference, September 2016: 'Quando un piccolo gruppo di studiosi e amici s'incontrò nel 2007, durante la *Fifteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies* ad Oxford, si pensò inizialmente di realizzare una traduzione con commento dell'Avellana attraverso il coordinamento di un'équipe internazionale di ricercatori' — Text no longer available on the internet.

[17] *Emperors, Bishops and Senators: The Significance of the* Collectio Avellana, April 2011, and *East and West, Constantinople and Rome: Empire and Church in the* Collectio Avellana, April 2013.

[18] The conference on '*The* Collectio Avellana *and other canonical collections of the Italian environment: training, contents and contexts',* has resulted in Lizzi Testa (ed.), *La* Collectio Avellana *fra Tardoantico e Alto Medioevo*, and R. Lizzi Testa and G. Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals* (Cambridge Scholars Newcastle, 2019).

[19] R. Gibson, 'On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections', *Journal of Roman Studies,* 102 (2012), pp. 56-78.

[20] K. Blair-Dixon, 'Memory and authority', pp. 70-73.

[21] D.J. Viezure, '*Collectio Avellana* and the Unspoken Ostrogothic Reconstruction in the Sixth Century' in Greatrex, Elton and McMahon (eds.), *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity*, pp. 99-102.

Philippe Blaudeau shares the view that *CA* 82-93 are a subsequent addition, 'imposed with a certain brutality to a body already established'.[22] Eckhard Wirbelauer argues that the collection was the result of the Laurentian schism (498-506/7), and that subsequent documents were later 'unordered and erroneous' additions. He thinks that the first section (letters 1-40) was a pro-Laurentian compilation, 'a precious record of "loser's history"'.[23] Bronwen Neil follows Wirbelauer's view and suggests that Hormisdas's correspondence and *CA* 82-93 were added later; she considers that the collection's five sections were compiled at different times and for various reasons.[24] More recently, Maria Escribano Paño has suggested that the two letters of the emperor Maximus (*CA* 39-40) appear unrelated to the rest of section 1 and challenge the thesis that a coherent discourse appears in the collection as a whole, or within its parts.[25]

Notwithstanding the broad consensus that the *Collectio* is not an integrated collection, some historians have attempted to identify an overarching purpose or, at least, the compiler's main interest or interests. Mostly, they point to assertions of papal primacy or independence, although several historians suggest different motivation. Blair-Dixon agrees with Günther that the *Collectio* was a unified compilation, and states that its central theme was the promotion of papal primacy.[26] Evers considers that the reason behind the collection is obscure but notes that it provides a closer look at the relationship between East and West, Rome and Constantinople, Church and Empire over nearly two centuries.[27] Viezure argues that interlocking narratives were the affirmation of papal independence and the air-brushing out of history of King Theoderic and his regime; with the elimination of the Ostrogoths, popes appeared as de facto rulers of the West in the sixth century.[28] Taking a different tack, Philippe Blaudeau promotes the view that the collection was probably initially compiled by a Roman cleric in the 530s to honour the memory and work of Dioscorus, Hormisdas's delegate during the settlement of the Acacian schism, who was elected bishop of Rome in the double election of 530.[29] Also offering a different explanation, Lizzi Testa argues that the main purpose was to collect primary documents for the later composition of edicts, treatises, and laws.[30]

---

[22] Blaudeau, *Le Siège de Rome*, p. 44. It is not clear why Blaudeau offers a later *terminus post quem.* He says, on p. 45, that the complier would have had access to the acts of the Roman synod, but does not explain why this is relevant if the original collection stopped with Hormisdas's correspondence.
[23] Quoted by Blair-Dixon, 'Memory and authority', pp. 63-4.
[24] B. Neil, 'Papal Letters and Letter Collections' in C. Sogno, B.K. Storin, and E.J. Watts (eds.), *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide,* Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature (Oakland, 2017), p. 452.
[25] M.V. Escribano Paño, 'Maximus' Letters in the *Collectio Avellana*: A Comparative Study' in Lizzi Testa and Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals,* p. 82.
[26] Blair-Dixon, 'Memory and authority', p.69.
[27] A. Evers, 'The *Collectio Avellana*: An 'Eccentric' Canonical Collection?', pp. 72.
[28] D.J. Viezure, 'Collectio Avellana and the Unspoken Ostrogothic Reconstruction', pp. 97-98.
[29] P. Blaudeau, *Le Siège de Rome*, pp. 42 and 45.
[30] R. Lizzi Testa, 'Introduction' in Lizzi Testa and Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals*, pp. xiv and xxxii.

An emerging issue is, or should be, the *Collectio's* genre: is it a canonical or a late antique letter collection? The project established at the University of Perugia is predicated on the assumption that it is a collection of canons. Although Lizzi Testa and others have come to acknowledge that the *Collectio* does not contain many conciliar canons, they have nevertheless sought to attribute to it the characteristics of canonical collections.[31] Evers notes that codification was becoming more common; he places the *Collectio* among the earlier 'primitive' canonical collections.[32] Dominic Moreau argues that collections were responses to the difficulties of the times: a dozen Italian collections, mostly Roman and including the *Collectio*, were composed during two great ecclesiastical conflicts or around dossiers assembled during them.[33] Mar Marcos argues that late antique law collections were closely related to affirming the authority of the bishop of Rome, and that the compiler's selection of the anti-Pelagian dossiers in the *Collectio* (*CA* 41-50, 94 & 97) fulfilled this objective.[34] There has been little to challenge the view that the *Collectio* is a collection of canons although an alternative has emerged with the recent research on letter collections.

Late Antique Letter Collections

The new scholarship on letter collections has the potential to show how the *Collectio* should be 'read' and to comment on its nature, i.e. whether it is an episcopal or a papal letter collection. While historians, notably Lizzi Testa and Evers, show an awareness of the scholarship, there is little evidence that they are applying its insights.[35] Letter collections were a well-established genre in the ancient world that developed in the fifth century due to the increase in the number of people who wished to make their presence felt within the empire, including educated and politically experienced bishops.[36] Roy Gibson analysed eleven collections, including four of Christian bishops, compiled between the first century BC and the fifth century AD. [37] He notes that they were usually arranged by theme, loose topic or addressee, or by artistic juxtaposition, variety or design. Chronology, as a basis of organisation, usually played a small or no part.[38] More than once he points to difficulties in interpretation and states that 'a hermeneutical burden is placed on the reader'.[39] Mary Beard opined on an earlier occasion that ancient letter

[31] Lizzi Testa, 'Introduction', *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals,* p. viii.
[32] A. Evers, 'The *Collectio Avellana* — collecting with a reason?' in Lizzi Testa and Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals,* p. 25.
[33] D. Moreau, 'The Compilation Process of Italian Canonical Collections during Antiquity' in Lizzi Testa and Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals,* pp. 336-69.
[34] M. Marcos, 'Anti-Pelagian Dossiers in Late Antique Canonical Collections' in Lizzi Testa and Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals,* pp. 102-122.
[35] Lizzi Testa, 'Introduction', pp. xi-xii; Evers, 'An "Eccentric" Canonical Collection?', p. 73.
[36] C. Sogno, B.K. Storin, and E.J. Watts, 'Introduction: Greek and Latin Epistolography and Epistolary Collections in Late Antiquity' in Sogno, Storin and Watts (eds.), *Late Antique Letter Collections,* p. 7.
[37] Gibson, 'On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections', pp. 56-78.
[38] See Gibson's paragraphs on *The Plinian Model: Artistic Variety and Significant Juxtaposition*, 'On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections', pp. 67-70.
[39] Gibson, 'On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections', pp. 68-69.

collections had 'sophisticated, comprehensive and tactical strategies of internal arrangement, comparable to the aesthetic of a poetry book'.[40] Gibson offers no overall purpose for some collections other than suggesting that the letter writers wished to show their skills in managing political, social and familial relations and to present examples for emulation.[41]

Gibson's work has been followed in short order by volumes edited by Bronwen Neil and Pauline Allen, and by Cristina Sogno and others, which focus mainly on episcopal collections and, to a much lesser extent, on papal ones.[42] With the entry of bishops, the range of letters expanded and the purposes of some collections changed: some bishops remained motivated by a wish to draw attention to their relationships with the cultural elite; the objectives of others were polemical and/or didactic.[43] Among the latter, Allen identifies the *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas,* and a collection of Theodoret of Cyrrhus.[44] The *Documenta* is a Syriac text, most of whose documents date from c.560-68; its purpose was to support the patriarch of Antioch, Paul the Black, 'whose turbulent and colourful career needed much defence'.[45] One of three of Theodoret's collections which survive comprises thirty-six letters conserved in *Acta* of the Council of Ephesus; the rationale behind many of its letters was to discredit or rehabilitate his christological and canonical positions.[46] While Allen and others tend to identify one such intention or objective for each collection, Bradley K. Storin identifies four concurrent objectives in the collection of Gregory of Nazianzus, albeit he describes them as 'programmatic motifs'.[47] Papal collections are distinguishable from episcopal ones: they are invariably preserved in canon law collections made from the sixth century and their purpose was 'not to fashion the image of the author, but to shape the image of the office of the bishop of Rome'.[48]

Argument and Methodology

Against the trend of previous and recent scholarship I argue that the *Collectio Avellana* is to be understood as a letter collection and that it had the three overarching objectives, which I set out

[40] M. Beard, 'Ciceronian Correspondences: Making a Book out of Letters' in *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome,* ed. T.P. Wiseman (Oxford, 2002), pp.103-44, quoted by Sogno, Storin and Watts (eds.), *Late Antique Letter Collections*, p.2.
[41] Gibson, 'On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections', p.74.
[42] B. Neil and P. Allen (eds.), *Collecting Early Christian Letters: From the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2015); Sogno, Storin and Watts (eds.), *Late Antique Letter Collections.*
[43] On the first point, see Sogno, Storin and Watts, 'Introduction: Greek and Latin Epistolography', pp. 6-7
[44] P. Allen, 'Rationales for episcopal letter-collections in late antiquity' in Neil and Allen (eds.), *Collecting Early Christian Letters*, pp. 18-19.
[45] Allen, 'Rationales for episcopal letter-collections', pp. 20-21.
[46] Allen, 'Rationales for episcopal letter-collections', p.28.
[47] B. K. Storin, 'The Letter Collection of Gregory of Nazianzus' in Sogno and Storin and Watts (eds.), *Late Antique Letter Collections,* pp. 84-5. The identified programmes were: to dissociate Gregory from the imperial court and episcopal conferences; to tie his identity to 'philosophy'; to establish his literary and social credentials; and to show his relationship with Basil of Caesarea.
[48] Neil, 'Papal Letters and Letter Collections', p.449.

at the start of this chapter: defending Pope Vigilius, showing developments in papal authority, and finally opining on Church-Empire relations. I also argue that the *Collectio* should be understood as an institutional response to the double challenges of 476 and 482 (the demise of western emperors and imperial challenges to papal primacy on doctrine). The Roman Church developed new expressions of primacy which were a direct response to imperial interventions in doctrinal issues which started in 482. Outside the supportive structure of the western Roman Empire, popes re-invented their position as the centre of the Christian *communio* by developing a new interpretation of the power 'to bind and loose' which emerged in the Acacian schism. The compiler's attempt to delineate relations between the Church and emperors reflected changes that were consequent to 476; prior to that date it had not been necessary to define the emperor's role in the Roman Church.

In this chapter, I place the content of the *Collectio* in its historic context and apply some of the insights of the new scholarship on episcopal and papal letter collections. The historical context comprises four developments in the hundred or so years before the Second Council of Constantinople in 553: the success of Pope Leo I at the Council of Chalcedon in 451; emperors' need to manage the opponents of Chalcedon in the East (especially miaphysites); the emergence of 'theopaschism' as an expression of opposition to the Council; and the demise of the line of emperors in the West in 476, which changed the wider environment in which the Roman Church functioned. The new scholarship's insights of particular relevance are those bearing on the design and the internal coherence of collections.

I divide the exposition of the argument that follows into five Parts. In Part I, I make some preliminary observations on the structure of the *Collectio* as a letter collection. These paragraphs contain assertions and argument which I justify in the subsequent Parts. In Parts 2,3 and 4, I show how the compiler sought to give effect to each of the three objectives identified above. In Part 5 I state my view on the compiler, his background and his target readership.

Part 1: Preliminary Observations on the Structure and Organisation of the *Collectio Avellana*

Aside from the position of what I designate as Section 5 (*CA* 82-92), the *Collectio Avellana* is primarily organised chronologically but, I consider, it also has design features which, once appreciated, help reveal the compiler's objectives. Gibson stresses that the hermeneutical burden is on the reader of a letter collection. He observes that on a first reading Pliny's nine books of letters appear to reflect random placing, but on a second attempt patterns begin to emerge: letters on the same subject, although often widely scattered, almost invariably preserve

a narrative order; the books have some chronological ordering even if individual books are not so ordered; and 'most strikingly', there was artistic design with the addressee of the final letter of Book 9 (Fuscus) creating a dialogue with the first letter of the collection (addressed to Clarus), suggesting movement from light to darkness.[49] I suggest that the *Collectio* is at the other end of the continuum: the chronological ordering is immediately apparent but, on further reading and analysis, design features surface.

In examining the *Collectio* and each constituent collection, I looked to see if it has design features and/or unifying themes. I have kept an open mind on what may constitute design. I follow Maassen rather than Günther in thinking that the sections should be evaluated on the basis of content rather than archival origin. I have looked to see if all documents contribute to the theme of their small collections or if they belong elsewhere. I have kept open the possibility that departures from a chronological basis and identified symmetries were intended. I have not confined myself to seeking a single overarching editorial objective for the collection.

I divide, as Günter did, the *Collectio* into five component parts, although I modify his categorisation and I use of the term 'section' rather than 'small collections' as I consider that the parts are more integrated than the latter term implies. Table 3.2 below sets out my proposed ordering, which broadly follows Günther but I make two adjustments to the composition of the sections and I subdivide three of the sections. He treated the five letters of Pope Leo I (*CA* 51-55) as a separate collection but there is insufficient reason to distinguish them from the letters of Pope Simplicius which follow: both sets of letters mainly concern the position of the see of Alexandria and were addressed variously to the eastern emperor, the archbishop of Constantinople, eastern bishops and/or clergy. I include them as part of Section 3. I treat *CA* 82-93, which count in their number the exchange of letters which represented the Roman Church's acceptance of the theopaschite formula and Pope Vigilius's First *Constitutum,* on a chronological basis as Section 5.

I consider that Section 1 (*CA* 1-40) is best understood when divided into subsections. Günther considered it concerned the schisms of Ursinus and Eulalius and other matters.[50] I identify four subsections and suggest that, in their totality, they reflect the compiler's positions on Church-Empire relations. The first subsection (*CA* 1-2: the *Praefatio* and the *Libellus qorumdam schmismaticorum*) indicates that the *Collectio* is a polemic in support of Pope Vigilius and against Justinian's interventions to define doctrine. This theme of opposition to imperial intervention is mirrored by the fourth subsection (*CA* 38-40). The fact that letters of the latter subsection are chronologically out of sequence supports the notion that its position in the

[49] Gibson, 'On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections', p. 68.
[50] *Prolegomena,* p. iii.

section has a structural purpose.[51] These subsections bookend the other two, documents reflecting on imperial involvement in two double elections (of Damasus/Ursinus and Boniface I/Eulalius). Collectively, the four subsections outline the role of the emperor in the Church.

I differ from Günther in my interpretation of Section 2 (*CA* 41-50). Whereas he, like Maassen, thought that it narrated the history of Pelagius (*historiam Pelagii*) in 417-18, I show that the letters were part of the defence of Vigilius in that they provide historical examples of prelates changing their minds.[52]

I include letters *CA* 51-81 and *CA* 94-104 in Section 3 which I describe as Pre- and Early Acacian schism. I divide the section in three. The content of each subsection differs, although there is an observable correspondence between subsections (a) and (c). The first subsection mainly comprises letters of Popes Leo and Simplicius concerning the sees of Alexandria and Antioch in the period before the start of the Acacian schism.[53] The subsection ends with *CA* 70, the report of the Synod of Rome (in 485, a year into the schism), which explained the excommunication of Acacius and those of Misenus and Vitalis, two Italian bishops who, as papal envoys, were suborned by the archbishop.[54] The third subsection, *CA* 79-81 & 93-104, discusses two topics, the Acacian schism and Pelagianism, but has its own coherence. All but two of the letters were written by Pope Gelasius, all but three were addressed to bishops or clergy in the Balkans (Dalmatia and/or Dardania). The third subsection mirrors the first in ending with a report of a Roman synod at which Misenus, but not Vitalis or Acacius, was readmitted to communion.[55]

The second subsection (*CA* 71-78) differs significantly from the other two. It comprises a series of forged letters purportedly sent to Peter the Fuller, the patriarch of Antioch, on the subject of his interpolated phrase in the *Trisagion* hymn. In terms of design, the subsection introduces 'theopaschism' which features in Sections 4 and 5, and the forgers, who may have been known at the time, were the Acoimetae monks (also known as the Sleepless Monks of the monastery of Eirenaion), who were the party identified for excommunication in the theopaschite formula acceptance letters of 534 and 536, which are in Section 5.[56]

There is a unity across Section 3's subsections**.** As mentioned, the first and third end with reports of synods. The report of the synod of 495 is actually the penultimate letter of the

[51] *CA* 38-40 were dated to shortly after 20 June 404, 386 or 387, and 385 respectively, while the dates of *CA* 14-37 are 418 or 419/20, and *CA* 41-50 were written in 417-18.
[52] *Prolegomena*, p. iii.
[53] *CA* 51-64 and 68-69 concern the see of Alexandria, while *CA* 65-67 discuss Antioch.
[54] *CA* 70.
[55] *CA* 103.
[56] A. Grillmeier with T. Hainthaler, trans. P. Allen and J. Cawte, *Christ in the Christian Tradition* (Vol. 2): *From the Council of Constantinople* (Part 2): *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century* (London, 1995), pp. 252-62.

Section, which might appear to spoil the symmetry but, I consider, the last letter (*CA* 104) has a purpose of its own: in closing the section Pope Symmachus refers back to Peter Mongos, Timothy Aelurus and Peter the Fuller, the subjects of the first two subsections.[57] Both the second and the third subsections have examples of popes (Felix III and Gelasius I) demonstrating leadership on a doctrinal issue.

Section 4 comprises the majority of the letters and documents in the *Collectio*; all relate to the settlement of the Acacian schism during the Pontificate of Hormisdas (514-23). I consider it is useful to sub-divide the section into pre-settlement (*CA* 105-40), settlement (*CA* 141-70) and the aftermath (*CA* 171-243).

I have no explanation for the positioning of *CA* 82-92 (Section 5) in the middle of Section 3 as they are significantly out of chronological order. The sequence contains Pope Vigilius's First *Constitutum* (*CA* 83), which is arguably the most significant document in the collection. As the most recent it provides a *terminus post quem* for the compilation. Given the care with which, as I show, the compiler selected the *Praefatio* as the first letter of collection, the position of the First *Constitutum* defies explanation, and we may speculate that at some stage a copyist may have mispositioned the dossier.

Table 3.2 The Revised Outline of the Sections in the *Collectio Avellana*

Section	*Years Covered*	Letters	*Subject Matter and subsections*
1	367-419	*CA* 1-40	a. *Praefatio* and *Libellus* (*CA* 1-2) [Construction of St Paul's Outside the Walls (*CA* 3)] b. Double election of Damasus and Ursinus (*CA* 4-13) c. Double election of Boniface I and Eulalius (*CA* 14-37) d. Three imperial letters on Church-Empire relations (*CA* 38-40)
2	417-18	*CA* 41-50	Prelates changing their minds
3	460-512	*CA* 51-81 and 94-104:	Pre- and Early Acacian Schism a. Pre-Schism: Popes Leo I and Simplicius (*CA* 51-70) b. Letters to Peter the Fuller of Antioch (*CA* 71-78) c. Popes Gelasius I and Symmachus to the Bishops of Dalmatia and Dardania (*CA* 79-81 and 94-104)
4	515-21	*CA* 105-243:	Settlement of the Acacian schism a. Pre-Settlement (*CA* 105-40) b. Settlement (*CA* 141-70) c. The aftermath of the settlement (*CA* 171-243)
5	534-40 and 553	*CA* 82-93	The Theopaschite Formula and the Three Chapters controversy

[57] *CA* 104.4 and 104.5.

Part 2: A Defence of Pope Vigilius

One of the compiler's main objectives was, I argue, to construct a defence of Pope Vigilius and/or the position he represented. Vigilius, under pressure from the emperor Justinian, condemned the Three Chapters in his Second *Constitutum* in February 554. In the previous year (May 553) he had defended them in his First *Constitutum*; earlier still, he had condemned the Chapters in the *Iudicatum* (548). The Three Chapters were certain works of Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428), Theodoret of Cyrrhus (d. 460?), and Ibas of Edessa (d. 457). Justinian had started to focus on their condemnation in 532 when miaphysite delegates, whom he had summoned to a conference to find a basis of compromise between supporters and opponents of Chalcedon, directed their fire on the works of Theodoret and Ibas. Even more than the theopaschite formula, the proposed condemnation called in question the decision of Chalcedon as the Council had endorsed the passages or the authors personally. Ostensibly, Vigilius's condemnation of the Chapters in 554 required defending. The compiler sought to achieve his objective in three ways: first, by using a historical example in Section 1 to underscore Vigilius' defiance of the emperor (focusing on his defiance of the emperor in issuing the First *Constitutum*); second, by presenting the pope in Section 5 in the best possible light; third, by arguing in Section 2 that popes and prelates could legitimately change their minds.

The Parallel Cases of Pope Liberius (352-66) and Pope Vigilius (537-555)

The first letter of the *Collectio* was intended, I argue, to portray Vigilius as a pope prepared to defy the emperor in defence of the Roman Church's right to determine orthodox doctrine. The *Praefatio* or the *Quae Gesta sunt inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos*, narrates, if briefly, the difficulties that Pope Liberius (352-66) experienced with the emperor Constantius II (337-61)'s involvement in religious issues in the fourth century. Ostensibly about Liberius and Constantius, I suggest the *Praefatio's* inclusion was intended as a comment on Vigilius and Justinian. There are strong parallels between the situations that Popes Liberius and Vigilius encountered. I suggest that there were two points that the compiler wanted the reader to note: first, that Vigilius was a pope who defended a doctrinal position in the face of opposition from the emperor; second, there was an important juridical principle that had a bearing on Vigilius's position in 553.

Strong historical parallels can be drawn between the events after the Council of Nicea (325) and those after Chalcedon (451), and between the actions of the emperors Constantius II (337-61) and Justinian (527-65). Neither Nicea, nor Chalcedon settled the Christological issues of their day. Constantine had summoned and managed Nicea. The Council defined Christ's nature

as ‘consubstantial’ with the Father. The period after Constantine’s death in 337, particularly the years 341-361, saw the debate re-open.[58] Opinion divided between those who adhered to the Nicene settlement and others who were unable to accept the term consubstantial and its implications. Supporters of Nicea were mainly to be found in the West, opponents in the East, although Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria and a staunch supporter of Nicea, defies this categorisation. This division was to be mirrored after the Council of Chalcedon, which declared that Christ had ‘one person but two natures’. Once again the main supporters of the Council were in the West, and its opponents almost universally in the East. After 350 Constantius sought to impose doctrinal and ecclesiastical unity on the divided Church. In 359 he strong-armed two synods, at Ariminium in the West and at Seleucia in the East, into accepting the formula that ‘the Son is like the Father’, and into agreeing not to use the terms *ousia* or *homoousios*, which had been adopted at Nicea. These actions were echoed later by Justinian’s attempts to achieve uniformity of belief across East and West by imposing the theopaschite formula and by engineering the condemnation of the Three Chapters at the Council of Constantinople in 553. Ultimately, both popes succumbed to their emperor: as a price for returning from exile, Liberius accepted the condemnation of Athanasius and signed up to a new creed drawn up by the Council of Sirmium;[59] Vigilius finally condemned the Three Chapters in his Second *Constitutum.*

I argue that the first two sentences of the *Praefatio* signify that an objective of the *Collectio* was to defend Vigilius’s reputation as an upholder of orthodoxy. They state that Constantius ordered all bishops to condemn Athanasius of Alexandria (328-73), that most bishops through fear of the emperor condemned him, but Liberius and three others (Eusebius of Vercellae, Lucifer of Caligari, and Hilary of Poitiers) did not wish to pass sentence, and were consequently exiled.[60] We are given to understand that a doctrinal issue was at stake in that Constantius sought Athanasius’s condemnation because the latter opposed Arians (*haereticis*).[61] As the first letter in a collection, I suggest that we should expect it to be significant, a point supported by the fact that, in a largely chronologically ordered collation, it is not the earliest letter.[62] The letter appears to anticipate the First *Constitutum*, chronologically the last document in the collection: the *Constitutum* was a direct challenge to Justinian’s authority on a matter of doctrine by a pope who was a virtual prisoner of the emperor in

[58] T.D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge MA, 1993), Chapters, III, VII, XI, and XIII.
[59] Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, p. 138.
[60] *CA* 1.1.
[61] *CA* 1.1: ‘haereticis Arrianis … Constantio, qui et Athanasium episcopum resistentem haereticis persecutus est’.
[62] The earliest was *CA* 5, dated to before 15 September 367.

Constantinople.[63] The correspondence between the *Praefatio* and the First *Constitutum* is clear and indicates that the opening sentences were intended to signal that the *Collectio* concerned the defence of orthodox doctrine by a pope, namely Vigilius.

I suggest that the compiler of the *Collectio* also wanted the reader to note a juridical principle in the *Praefatio* that applied to Vigilius's position in 553. The opening sentences refer to Athanasius being condemned although he was innocent and unheard (*inauditum*).[64] The concept is repeated at the end of the letter, when Italian bishops, whom Damasus invited to a birthday celebration and whom he encouraged to pass judgement on Ursinus, replied 'we have come to a birthday party, not to condemn someone unheard'.[65] Later in the collection, Pope Zosimus criticised African bishops for passing judgement on Pelagius without hearing him; he declared that it was not the Roman custom to condemn any man before he has a chance to confront his accusers.[66] These statements reflect Vigilius's situation in May 553: the emperor's representatives at the Council of Constantinople refused to accept the First *Constitutum* and Justinian issued a decree enacting that the pope's name was to be removed from the diptychs. Vigilius was, in effect, suspended from his position as pope without being heard.[67]

Given the way the *Liber Pontificalis* depicts him, Liberius may appear a questionable model for Vigilius, but he may have been seen differently in the fourth and sixth centuries. The *Liber* notes that Liberius gave his assent to the heretic Constantius and that from the time of his recall there was a great persecution in Rome.[68] It also states that his rival Felix II proclaimed the emperor a heretic and consequently suffered martyrdom.[69] In contrast, the *Praefatio* is positive and this was not the only sympathetic view of Liberius. Athanasius, who until Liberius's capitulation in 357 had been supported by the pope, opined that his surrender 'reveals both [his opponents'] violent behaviour and also Liberius's hatred of heresy and his vote for Athanasius, when he still had a free choice. Statements produced under torture and against a person's original judgement express the wishes not of the intimidated, but of the torturers'.[70] The ecclesiastical historian Sozomen, writing in the fifth century, largely echoed the *Praefatio* in stating that when Constantius visited Rome the people called loudly for Liberius's return from exile.[71] As to the situation at his return, 'The people of Rome regarded Liberius as a very

[63] R. Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553 with related texts on the Three Chapters Controversy*, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 51, 2 vols (Liverpool, 2009/2012), vol. 1, p. 53.
[64] *CA* 1.1: 'pontifices inauditum innocentemque damnantes'.
[65] *CA* 1.13: 'nos ad natale convenimus, non ut inauditum damnemus'.
[66] *CA* 46.11: 'non est consuetudo Romanis damnare aliquem hominem priusquam is, qui accusatur, praesentes habeat accusatores locumque defendi accipiat ad abluenda crimina'.
[67] Price, *Acts of the Council of Constantinople*, 1, p. 53.
[68] *LP* 37.6.
[69] *LP* 38.1.
[70] Athanasius, *The History of the Arians*, translation (Limovia.net, 2013), p. 85.
[71] Sozomen, *The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, trans with introduction by H. Wace and P. Schaff, Second Series Vol. 2 (Oxford/New York, 1891), IV.11, p. 307.

excellent man, and esteemed him highly on account of the courage he had evinced in opposing the emperor, so that they had even [incited] sedition on his account, and had gone so far as to shed blood'. [72] While it requires an element of speculation, for some the memory of Liberius in Rome in the sixth century may have been different to how it appears in the *Liber* and, if so, he would have been a credible precursor.

An Implicit Defence of Pope Vigilius (Section 5)

The content of Section 5 is, I consider, a significant, if implicit, defence of Pope Vigilius. Only three of the twelve letters that comprise the section are attributable to him: two letters written to Justinian and Archbishop Menas of Constantinople in 540 and the First *Constitutum*.[73] I suggest that the two letters need to be understood in the context of the exchanges of letters with Justinian by which Popes John II in 534 and Agapetus in 536 accepted the theopaschite formula. Those exchanges also appear in the section.[74] Acceptance of the formula was a defeat for the Roman Church as it potentially re-opened the definition of Christ's nature that had been agreed at Chalcedon. In his two letters Vigilius was responding to Justinian's request that he confirm Agapetus' acceptance of the formula; the letters show him attempting to repair the situation left by his predecessors. By selecting the First *Constitutum* in which Vigilius demonstrated courage in refusing to condemn the Three Chapters, rather than the earlier *Iudicatum* or the later Second *Constitutum* in which he condemned them, the compiler appears to have wished to show the pope at his best.

Vigilius's response to Justinian's request was not a straightforward affirmation of his predecessor's statement. The nature of the defeat represented by acceptance of the formula in 534 and 536 was made more apparent by the absence in the core documents of the reference to Pope Leo's Tome and the Council of Chalcedon in combination which, as I discuss below, had become a hallmark assertion of papal primacy in the early sixth century.[75] The defeat was further underlined by John's and Agapetus's willingness to respond positively to Justinian's requests in the same letters to excommunicate the Acoimetae monks. Their excommunication would have been symbolically important as they had been pro-Chalcedonian supporters of the papacy in the Acacian schism and they were opponents of Justinian's attempt to impose the formula.[76] In replying, the two popes equated the *communio fidei* over which popes had control with those who agreed with the emperor's profession of faith: for instance, Agapetus, after confirming that Justinian's profession was orthodox, stated that 'if any of our catholic faith

[72] Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, IV. 15, p. 310.
[73] *CA* 92, 93, and 83 (*Vigilii constitutum de tribus capitulis*).
[74] *CA* 84 and 91.
[75] See pp. 90-92 below.
[76] J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church AD 450-680,* Church in History Series, no. 2 (New York, 1989), pp. 191 and 201.

contends otherwise (*contraire temptaverit*), he will be excommunicated'.[77] The stark nature of this equation was slightly modified by Pope John II who stated that he had attempted to recall the monks to the right faith, as sheep to the sheepfold, and by Pope Agapetus who declared that he would in no way restore them to communion unless, in a way compliant with the canons, they followed apostolic doctrine.[78] Given that, as I show below, popes had acquired a new power to determine membership of the Christian community, which was implicitly recognised in Justinian's request that they excommunicate the monks, I consider John's and Agapetus's willingness to do so was a major concession and it is not surprising that Vigilius tried to regain ground.[79]

In his response to Justinian in 540 Vigilius referred three times to Leo and his Tome, repetitions that were unlikely to have been accidental.[80] Despite 'embracing and approving all things' in Justinian's written statement of faith, he did not go as far as his predecessors in endorsing the emperor's position.[81] He did not suggest that disagreement with Justinian's profession of faith was a basis for excommunication: in discussing specific sanctions against heretics or dissenters, he referred, not to the emperor's opponents, but to those who had been engaged in the Christological disputes of the fifth and early sixth centuries.[82] He specifically distinguished his position in emphasising the route back for those repenting: '[we do not deviate] from the faith of our above mentioned predecessors,… *unless perhaps if* [heretics], after removing the fog of heretical doctrine in which they were wallowing, have sought to follow the truth of the faith with the correction of a matching penance' (italics added).[83] Vigilius underscored this point with an additional reference to an 'entrance of repentance and communion' for those who had 'come to their senses' and accepted the decisions of the four synods (Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus I and Chalcedon) and of pontiffs of the apostolic see.[84] Vigilius repeated the message in similar terms in his letter to Menas, stressing that the touchstone for communion was adherence to the decisions of the four synods and those of Leo

[77] *CA* 91.4: 'si quis nostrae catholicae fidei contraire temptaverit, … <a> sancta communione efficiatur extraneus'.
[78] *CA* 84.26: 'apostolicis suasionibus ad rectan fidem et velut oves, quae perierant errantes, ad ovile contendimus revocare dominicum'; *CA.* 91.5: 'nisi sub satisfaction canonica doctrinam apostolicam fuerint consecuti, nullatenus patimur eos sacrae communioni restitui'.
[79] See pp. 95-101 below.
[80] On the significance of Leo, his Tome and Chalcedon see pp. 91-92 below.
[81] *CA* 92.7: 'amplectantesque et in omnibus comprobantes fidei vestrae libellum'.
[82] For instance, *CA* 92.4: 'Hormisdas atque Iohannes senior nec non et Agapitus decessores nostri per omnia conservantes universos Nestorianae atque Eutychianae sequaces haeresis iustae mucrone sententiae perculerunt'. *CA* 92.9 includes references to Severus of Antioch, Peter Apamena and Anthimus of Constantinople.
[83] *CA* 92.7-8: 'nihilque a saepe dictorum prodecessorum nostrorum fide deviantes, sub qualibet occasione servamus, nisi forte si haeresis, in qua volutantur, amputata caligine supra scriptae fidei veritatem paenitentiae competentis voluerint correctione sectari'.
[84] *CA*, 92.10: 'secundum praesulum sedis apostolicae constituta his, qui resipuerint et praecedentium synodorum vel supra scriptorum apostolicae sedis pontificum suscererint constituta, paenitentiae et communionis adytum reseremus'. The synods are mentioned in *CA* 92.6.

I.[85] I suggest Vigilius's modifications to the exchanges with Justinian show him attempting to reposition the papacy in its relations with the emperor and to recover the initiative over the papal claim to control membership of the Christian community, rather than simply placing that power at the service of the secular ruler.

Selection of the First *Constitutum* put Vigilius in a better light than his condemnations of the Three Chapters would have done, but the document is also significant for presenting the pope as having a principled position that was grounded both in the decisions of Chalcedon and in the developing understanding of the pope's 'power to bind and loose' which emerged in the Acacian schism. Vigilius's defence of Theodoret of Cyrrhus and the letter of Ibas to Mari was straightforward and unqualified. The reputations of both were attacked by the miaphysite delegates to a conference in Constantinople in 532 on the grounds they had challenged some of Cyril of Alexandria's Twelve Chapters, which were the basis of his criticism of Nestorius and his management of the Council of Ephesus I (431). Miaphysites claimed that their own positions were consistent with Cyril's theology, the touchstone of orthodoxy in the East. In defence of the Chapters, Vigilius argued that the Council of Chalcedon had accepted that Theodoret had embraced the theology of Cyril and that his previous criticism of the Alexandrian prelate should be passed over in silence. He further argued the Council had accepted that Ibas had misunderstood certain of Cyril's passages and that his views were in fact orthodox.[86] Vigilius's approach on Theodore of Mopsuestia differed: he anathematized sixty of his extracts but refused to condemn him as he had died 'in the peace of the Church'.[87] Importantly, in his defence of Theodore, he quoted passages from two letters in the *Collectio,* the report of the Synod of Rome (495) and Gelasius I's letter to the Dardanians, which discussed the power to bind and loose and the limitations of that power in regard to the deceased.[88]

Vigilius's stance on the condemnation of Theodore sharpened the debate on whether the pope or Church had the power to bind or loose post-mortem. This debate was intimately related to another discussion, whether saints were active after death and could perform miracles, the

[85] *CA* 93.5: 'ut si vel eorum vel quorumlibet errantium quis agnita catholicae fidei veritate paenitentiam agens reverti voluerit et haeresi, in qua volutatur, errore concepto scripturae quoque professione universam errorum suorum ac complicum damnaverit pravitatem et apostolicae sequens instituta doctrinae anathema dixerit ei, qui vel praedictas quattuor synodus in fidei causa non sequitur vel beatae recordationis prodecessoris nostri Leonis in omnibus non confitetur … tunc communioni nostrae, quam nulli nos negare convenit paenitenti … satisfaction modis aggregator…'
[86] *CA* 83.221-27 (Theodoret of Cyrrhus) and *CA* 83.236-83 (the Letter of Ibas), translated by Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople,* vol. 2, pp. 191-93 and 195-205.
[87] *CA* 83.29-197 (the 60 extracts) and *CA* 83.204-20 ('death while in the peace of the Church'), translated by Price, *Acts of the Council of Constantinople,* vol. 2, pp. 150-85 and 186-91. On the latter point see also p.142.
[88] *CA* 101.8 and *CA* 83.215; *CA* 103.28 and *CA* 83.216. See Price, *Acts of the Council of Constantinople,* vol. 2, pp. 189-90. Other letters in the *Collectio* which are quoted in the First *Constitutum* are *CA* 56 and 60, for which see *CA* 83.295 and 83.296 and Price, *Acts of the Council,* p. 209.

central idea on which the economy of salvation associated with saints' cults and a major source of the Church's income depended.[89] Even if Justinian ignored the First *Constitutum*, there was a perceived need among eastern churchmen to address the point behind the pope's defence of Theodore. Eustratius, who engaged with Gregory I on the post-mortem activity of saints, secured for his patron Eutychius the see of Constantinople through his successful justification of post-mortem anathematization.[90] Gregory I resolved this issue for the Roman Church when, as Pelagius II's deacon, he defended the authority of the Council of 553 in a letter to the Istrian bishops.[91] Up to that time, the Church's position may have been in doubt.[92] I suggest that, in selecting the First *Constitutum* and showing that Vigilius's position was consistent with that of Gelasius, the compiler set out to show Vigilius as a principled opponent of the condemnation and a defender of orthodoxy. In presenting this image, the compiler probably felt the need to explain why Vigilius had earlier condemned the Chapters in his *Iudicatum*; he devoted a section to explaining why popes could change their minds.

Popes could change their minds (Section 2)

Section 2 ostensibly refers to the condemnation of Pelagius and his chief supporter Caelestius in 417-18 but, if we consider more of the letters in the section, their purpose seems to provide precedents for popes changing their minds and, as such, they spoke to the position of Pope Vigilius in the years 548-53. I consider that Pelagianism per se was not the compiler's concern in selecting documents for the section; nor do I consider, notwithstanding two significant letters by Gelasius I on the heresy, that it was a theme in the *Collectio*.[93] Instead, I suggest, he was interested in providing examples of a pope changing his ruling on Pelagius: Pope Zosimus (417-18) first overturned Innocent I (401-17)'s judgement on Pelagius, then reversed his own. The letters showing this are followed by two others which imply that Pope Sixtus III (432-40), and Cyril of Alexandria, probably the most eminent eastern theologian of the fifth century, also changed their minds about Pelagius. I suggest that the intended message of the section was not

[89] This subject is covered comprehensively by Matthew Dal Santo in *Debating the Saints' Cult in the Age of Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2012). See in particular pp. 36-37 and 55-62.
[90] Dal Santo, *Debating the Saints' Cult*, p. 58.
[91] Markus dates the letter to before or just after Gregory's return from Constantinople — *Gregory the Great and his World*, p. 128, n.13. In this he mainly follows Paul Meyvaert who argues on the basis of Gregory's use of Greek sources, that his letter was written at or about the time he returned from his role as *apocrisiarius* in Constantinople (c.585/86), so between c.585 and 590 — 'A Letter of Pelagius II Composed by Gregory the Great' in J. C. Cavadini (ed.), *Gregory the Great: A Symposium* (Notre Dame/London, 1995), pp. 94-116 but particularly p.100. Gregory also settled the debate in respect of saint-cults — see Dal Santo, *Debating the Saints' Cult*, pp. 71-83 but particularly p. 78.
[92] I suggest that it is of some significance that several of the relatively few annotations on the two eleventh-century manuscripts are against paragraphs that relate to the principle of not condemning post-mortem. As this issue had been settled by c.585 it seems likely that the annotations were originally made in the period 553-c.585 when the issue still mattered and the eleventh-century copyist reproduced them faithfully. The annotations appear against paragraphs 214-218 of the First *Constitutum.*
[93] Gelasius's letters are *CA* 94 and 97.

a history of Pelagianism but the principle that popes and prelates did and could legitimately change their minds on a doctrinal issue.

The key letters of the section are *CA* 41, in which Innocent condemned Pelagius, and three letters of Zosimus (*CA* 45, 46 and 50). In condemning Pelagius, Innocent endorsed the decisions of two African synods held in 416.[94] On Innocent's death, Caelestius, Pelagius' major follower, went to Rome and submitted himself to the new pope's judgement. In the first of his letters to Aurelius and all African bishops, Zosimus told the African bishops that they had been too hasty in their judgement, and called on those who had a case against Pelagius to appear in Rome within two months.[95] Subsequently, in a somewhat opaque letter, Zosimus cleared Pelagius.[96] After the African bishops appealed to the emperor Honorius at Ravenna, Zosimus backtracked. In his letter of 21 March 418, which is replete with assertions of papal authority, he informed them that 'we have done nothing that we would not refer to you by letter, and we are giving this in a fraternal spirit and consulting on common basis, not because we do not know what needs to be done, … but because, in an equal manner, we wish to share with you the management of the person who had been accused before you'.[97] Zosimus's volte-face was complete.

The other letters in the section divide into those which supplement this picture and two which underscore the theme of popes changing their minds. *CA* 42, 43 and 44, all written by Innocent, concern the burning of a monastery in Bethlehem for which Pelagians were held responsible. These letters may have been included because the event in Bethlehem secured Innocent's support for the anti-Pelagian movement.[98] *CA* 47, from Deacon Paul of Milan to Zosimus, explains why Caelestius should not have been cleared: he had not disavowed propositions for which he had been condemned at a synod in 411. I suggest that the two remaining letters were included as they echo the argument of the section. In *CA* 48 Augustine rejoiced at the priest Sixtus's repudiation of very pernicious Pelagian dogma.[99] This would be unremarkable but for the fact that the priest was the future Pope Sixtus III, who had been a patron of Pelagius when

[94] The synods of Mileu and Carthage. These condemnations were additional to the one by a synod of Carthage in 411. Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society,* p. 453.
[95] *CA* 45.8
[96] C*A* 46.4.
[97] *CA* 50.4: 'nihil egimus, quod non ar vestram notitiam nostris ultro letteris referremus, dantes hoc fraternitati et in commune consulentes, non quid quia deberet fieri nesciremus … sed pariter vobiscum voluimus habere tractum de illo,qui apud vos … fuerat accusatus'.
[98] G. D. Dunn notes the significance of the attack on the monastery to Innocent's thinking in 'Innocent I and the Attacks on the Bethlehem Monasteries', *Journal of the Australian Early Medieval Association,* 2 (2006). pp. 69-83.
[99] *CA* 48.4: 'exultanti alacritate descripsimus et quibus poteramus magno studio legebamus, ubi nobis exposuisti, quid de illo perniciososssimo vel quid contra de gratia dei, quam pusillis magnisque largitur, cui est illud inimicissimum, sentias'.

the latter was resident in Rome.[100] In the other letter, a certain Eusebius chides Cyril of Alexandria for harbouring and remaining in communion with Pelagians, when Innocent and everyone else had condemned them.[101] A decade or so later during the Nestorian controversy, Cyril would roundly condemn Pelagianism.[102] With these two examples, one a pope, the other an outstanding theologian whose writings were still influencing the Council of Constantinople in 553, I suggest the compiler of the *Collectio* was reinforcing the point that prelates could change their minds on issue of doctrine.

The contemporary relevance of the argument is, I suggest, apparent in a letter that Gregory the Great, as deacon to Pelagius II, sent to the archbishop and bishops of Istria during the schism that followed Vigilius's condemnation of the Three Chapters.[103] Gregory sought to address their concern that they were expected to move to a position which, at the beginning of the controversy, the apostolic see and all the leading prelates in Latin provinces had strongly resisted. Gregory presented what Robert Markus has described as the first occasion of 'a careful defence of the change of mind on the part of the papacy'.[104] Gregory argued that God had allowed Paul to turn from being a long-time opponent of the Christian faith to becoming its preacher.[105] Further, under correction from Paul, Peter changed his position on not admitting Gentiles to communion without circumcision: Paul publicly pointed out to Peter that even though he was a Jew, he lived as a gentile and consequently could not expect gentiles to become Jews.[106] In relation to the Three Chapters Gregory argued that a change of position required a change of understanding: 'Very dear brethren, do you think that to Peter, who was reversing his position, one should have replied: We refuse to hear what you say since you previously taught the opposite? If in the matter of the Three Chapters one position was held while the truth was being sought, and a different position was adopted after truth had been found, why should a change of position be imputed a crime to this See which is humbly venerated by all in the person of its founder'.[107] Gregory wrote in c.585 but his argument may

---

[100] P. Brown, 'Pelagius and his Supporters: Aims and Environment' in P. Brown, *Religion and Society in the Age of Augustine* (London, 1972), pp. 185 and 202, and P. Brown 'The Patrons of Pelagius: The Roman Aristocracy between East and West' in Brown, *Religion and Society*, pp. 222-23.
[101] *CA.* 49.2: 'quomodo nunc, cum beatae memoriae Innocentius haeresim Pelagianam Caelestianamque cum suis (sic) capitibus condemnaverit, cunctis eos abicientibus Orientalibus, Alexandrina sola ecclesia in communionem receipt?'
[102] L. Wickham, 'Pelagianism in the East' in R. Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 203-4.
[103] See page 86, n.91 above.
[104] Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World*, p. 128.
[105] Pelagii *Ep*. 5.7, *PL* 72, col. 0722: 'quod diu Saulum omnipotens Deus repugnatorem suae fidei esse permisit, et sic eum suae fidei praedicatorem fecit'.
[106] Pelagii *Ep*. 5.8, *PL* 72, col. 0723: 'dixi Petro coram omnibus: Si tu, cum Judaeus sis, non judaice vivis, quomodo gentes cogis judaizare?'
[107] Pelagii *Ep*. 5.8, *PL.* Vol. 72, col.0723: 'Nunquid, fratres lectissimi, Petro apostolorum principi sibi dissimilia docent debuit ad haec verba responderi? Haec quae dicis audire non possumus quid aliud ante praedicasti? Si igitur in trium capitulorum negotio aliud cum veritas quaereretur, aliud autem inventa veritate, dictum est, cur mutation sententiae sententiae huic sedi in crimine objicitur, quae a cuncta

reflect a defence that was developed by the Roman Church soon after Vigilius's capitulation in 554. The argument could have equally applied to Vigilius' change of position between 548 and 553.

Marcos has recently argued, on what is an a priori basis, that the *Collectio* is a late antique canon law collection and the purpose of the 'Pelagian dossier' was to affirm the authority of the bishop of Rome and his capacity to resolve the ecclesiastical affairs of the churches of the West.[108] Certainly, Zosimus's letter to Aurelius and the Council of Carthage is replete with assertions of papal authority, but this was the communication in which he acknowledged surrender to the weight of opinion in the African Church.[109] However, if as I argue that the *Collectio* should be read as a letter collection, then the section had a very different purpose.

Given Vigilius's capitulation to Justinian soon after the First *Constitutum*, the strong opposition to the condemnation of the Chapters in the West, and the criticism of the pope in the second part of life of Silverius in the *Liber Pontificalis* implicating him in the death of his predecessor, the argument that an objective of the *Collectio* was to defend his reputation and record may appear a difficult sell.[110] However, like Liberius in the fourth century, a positive assessment may have prevailed in 554 and for some time afterwards. Claire Sotinel argues that news about the Council was virtually non-existent in Italy, and for months churches in the West assumed that consent to the condemnation had been given by Pelagius.[111] Vigilius's reputation may have benefited from his successor's unpopularity: the *LiberPontificalis* reports that 'monasteries and a large number of the devout withdrew from communion with Pelagius, saying that he had implicated himself in the death of pope Vigilius'.[112]

Collectively, the parallel with Liberius, the implicit defence, and the argument that popes could change their minds strongly suggest that a major objective of the compiler was to defend Vigilius's reputation. For this there is a near contemporary parallel in the Syriac *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas*, which was compiled in c.580 and comprises a number of small dossiers that were collated to defend Paul the Black against the charges levelled at

---

Ecclesia humiliter in eius auctore veneratur'. Translation by Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World*, p. 128.

[108] Marcos, 'Anti-Pelagian Dossiers', p. 116.

[109] *CA* 50. Inter alia, it contains one of the first references by a pope to the power of binding and loosing. This letter is a rare example of cases where I would agree with George Demacopoulos's thesis that the rhetoric of papal authority increased in moments of weakness.

[110] *LP* 60.6-9.

[111] C. Sotinel, 'The Three Chapters and the Transformation of Italy' in C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt (eds.), *The Crisis of* Oikoumeme: *The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean,* Studies in the Early Middle Ages (Turnhout, 2007), p. 93. Sotinel also says that uncertainty over Vigilius's attitude after the Council continued into the twentieth century and was only resolved by the dissertation of Engelbert Zettl of 1929 — see p. 93, n. 32. However, given the reactions in North Africa, Milan and Aquileia, it seems unlikely that there was not some awareness of Vigilius's Second *Constitutum.*

[112] *Liber Pontificalis,* 62.1; also, Sotinel, 'The Three Chapters', p. 95.

him.[113] Like the *Collectio* it was organised on a chronological basis and it contains both doctrinal and other documents. Unlike the *Collectio,* the defence seems to have been entirely personal. In the *Collectio* it is not entirely clear whether the compiler wished to defend Vigilius or the position of a party within the Church that was hostile to the condemnation of the Three Chapters and which sought to maintain the integrity of the decisions of Chalcedon, and which possibly also adhered to Gelasius I's view that the pope and the Church did not have the power to condemn or absolve the deceased.

Part 3: Primacy and Papal Authority

I argue that the editor of the *Collectio Avellana* was also concerned to document the development of and to assert two new expressions of papal primacy and authority, one doctrinal, the other jurisdictional. First, he asserted doctrinal primacy by selecting letters that focused on Pope Leo I (440-61)'s achievement at the Council of Chalcedon (451). This was reinforced by two other sets of letters that show popes leading on doctrinal issues: Pope Felix III (483-92) appearing to orchestrate an attack on Peter the Fuller of Antioch's extreme version of theopaschism, and Pope Gelasius I (492-96) displaying a competence in theology that was relatively rare among popes, but which may have been considered a requirement in the head of a Church which claimed to be the arbiter of orthodoxy. Second, the compiler tracked the emergence and evolution of a new interpretation of Matthew 16:18-19, the 'power to bind and loose' (*potestas ligandi solvendique*), which had been granted by Christ to Peter and his successors. It evolved in the Acacian schism into the right of the pope to determine membership of the Christian community. Contrary to George Demacopoulos's thesis that assertions of papal authority were largely rhetorical and the Roman Church expressed them most strongly at the times of its greatest weakness, this expression had traction, even if popes had ultimately to submit to the realities of imperial power.[114]

Pope Leo's Tome and the Council of Chalcedon

I argue that the compiler shows how the Roman Church attempted to assert its doctrinal primacy by pointing to and building on the success of Pope Leo I at Chalcedon. The Council of Chalcedon had accepted Leo's Tome and declared 'This knowledge, descending to us like a golden chain by order of the Enactor, you have yourself preserved, being for all the interpreter

[113] The *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas* was, in all probability, compiled by a miaphysite member of Paul's party. It includes a *Defence* which deals with the procedure and reasons for Paul's deposition, as well as doctrinal aspects. See A. Van Roey and P. Allen (eds.), *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta no. 56 (Leuven, 1994), pp. 267-303, especially pp. 272-74, 291-98, 300-03.
[114] Demacopoulos, *The Invention of Peter*, p.2.

of the of the voice of the blessed Peter, and bringing down on all the blessing of his faith'.[115] Leo's success was important evidence of the acceptance of the Church's leadership on doctrinal issues; further in the same letter: 'Of these you were the leader, as head of the members, exhibiting your prudence in those who represented you'.[116] This significant success happened at the time when the Roman Church was beginning to assert its claim to primacy on doctrine.[117] A reason why Popes objected to Zeno's *Henotikon,* which triggered the Acacian schism, was its deliberate omission of any substantive reference to Chalcedon.[118] The way in which popes repeatedly referred to Leo, his Tome and Chalcedon, and sought adherence to them, suggests a concerted effort to consolidate Leo's success. I argue that calling on this achievement was an expression and an assertion of primacy.

A striking feature of the *Collectio* is the number of references to Leo and his Tome (*epistulae*), usually linked with Chalcedon.[119] A number of the major documents refer to them. The *Indiculus*, a briefing for the embassy charged with going to Constantinople in 516 to settle the Acacian schism, mentions the combination of Chalcedon and Leo's Tome no fewer than seven times.[120] Between April 517 and March 521 there were eight occasions on which Hormisdas, or his delegates in their reports, mentioned Leo's Tome in combination with Chalcedon.[121] Those returning to communion with Rome had to sign the *libellus* requiring them, inter alia, to state that they followed and embraced the Council of Chalcedon, and that they accepted and approved Leo's Tome, although the statements do not appear together.[122] Three significant *libelli* appear in the *Collectio*, each of which mentions the combination: that of the very reluctant Archbishop John of Constantinople in 519 and those of Justinian and Archbishop

[115] Quoted and translated by R. Price and M. Gaddis (eds.), *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 45, 3 vols. (Liverpool, 2005), vol. 3, p. 121.
[116] Price and Gaddis, *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. 3, p. 121.
[117] Blaudeau, 'Rome contre Alexandrie?', pp. 140-45.
[118] Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*, pp. 198-201.
[119] Throughout the *Collectio* Leo's Tome is referred to as *epistulae* or *epistolae*.
[120] *CA* 116.
[121] For Hormisdas's letters to easterners: *CA* 132.2: 'sanctam Chalcedonensem synodum et beati Leonis de fide catholica conscriptas epistolas'; *CA* 140.12: 'Chalcedonensem synodum in qua omnium reverential continetur, sed et venerandi Leonis … constituta'; *CA* 149.11: 'quae a sancta synodo Chalcedonensi constituta sunt et quae beati Leonis epistula continet'; *CA* 150: 'Chalcedone habitum pro religione conventum. ian te quoque, quod idem amplecti testatus es, beati Leonis redeuntem dogma comitabitur'; *CA* 236.19: 'sed cum in minibus omnium sint et synodica constituta et beati papae dogmata'; *CA* 238.14: 'ubi sancta Calcedonensis synodus et inter sanctos venerandi papae Leonis religiosissima constituta locum alicuius honoris habuerunt'. From Hormisdas' delegates' reports commenting on their handling of the Acacian schism settlement: *CA* 216.8: 'nihil aliud responsum dare nisi "sufficit sanctum Calcedonense concilium, in quo et aliae synodi continentur; sufficient epistolae papae Leonis, quas synodus confirmavit …"'; *CA* 217.9: 'extra quattuor synodos, extra epistolas papae Leonis … quic non continetur in praedictis synodis aut quod non est scriptum a papa Leone, non suscipimus'
[122] *CA.* 116b.2 and 3: 'una cum isto anathematizantes Eutychen et Dioscorum Alexandrinum in sancta synodo, quam sequimur et amplectimur, Calcedonensi damnatos' and 'quapropter suscipimus et probamus epistolas beati Leonis papae universas, quas de Christiana religione conscripsit'.

Menas in 536. The latter two were side letters to an exchange by which Pope Agapetus confirmed acceptance of theopaschite formula in 536.[123]

I argue that the references to Pope Leo and the Council of Chalcedon represent an assertion of papal leadership on doctrine. These letters show how the Church actually argued its position in the period 519-36, but I suggest there were two elements in play. The Roman Church feared that Zeno's *Henotikon* and Justinian's attempt to impose the theopaschite formula (and later to condemn the Three Chapters) would re-open all that had been decided at Chalcedon. The deacon Dioscorus, a significant member of the embassy that Hormisdas sent to Constantinople to settle the Acacian schism, and one of two papal candidates elected in 530, warned the pope: 'if after the Council of Chalcedon, if after Pope Leo's Tome, if after the *libelli* which bishops have given and are giving, and through which they give satisfaction to the apostolic see, anything new is added again, it seems to me that anything achieved (*factum*) will be destroyed'.[124] The second element was the emphasis on Leo's leadership. As the references show, these two elements had become inextricably linked. In addition to showing how the Church managed the position in regard to Chalcedon from after the Council in 451 until 553, the compiler shows, I suggest intentionally, a component of papal authority in action in the fifth and sixth century: actual leadership on doctrine. His consciousness of this is suggested by his additional selection of letters that show two other popes demonstrating the same form of leadership: Pope Felix III purportedly leading on a doctrinal issue that affected the eastern churches and Gelasius I demonstrating competence as a theologian.

Pope Felix III and the Interpolated Trisagion

On the face of it, Section 3(b) (*CA* 71-78) is a curious dossier in the collection but it serves to introduce 'theopaschism' and to provide an example of a pope leading on a doctrinal subject in the East.[125] The issue arose from additional words inserted by Peter the Fuller, the miaphysite bishop of Antioch, into the *Trisagion*, a hymn that was part of the liturgy of the eastern Church. Conflict over the issue was mainly played out in Constantinople and Antioch. Eduard Schwartz established that the letters were later forgeries.[126] They were probably written in c.510, at the height of tensions over the interpolation in Constantinople, by the Acoimetae monks who were

[123] *CA* 159, 89 and 90.
[124] *CA Ep.* 216.10: 'inter alia, si post synodum Calcedonensem, si post epistolas papae Leonis, si post libellos, quos dederunt et dant episcopi et per Ipsos satisfecerunt sedi apostolicae, iterum aliquid novum additur, sic mihi videtur, quia quicquid factum est destruitur'.
[125] The dossier in the *Collectio* is one of three recensions of the collection; its letters are re-translations from Greek copies. For details of the different recensions, see Grillmeier, *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, p. 253, n.109. Günther, *Prolegomena*, pp. lxiiii-lxvi, states that source for the compiler seems to have been the Greek volume of letters which is contained in a manuscript which conserves non-genuine letters which Frederick Maassen called *Sammlung in Sachen des Monophysites.*
[126] E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma* (Munich, 1934), p. 292, quoted by Grillmeier, *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, p. 253.

supporters of the Church of Rome and Chalcedon.[127] All the letters are addressed to Peter. At some point in the 470s, he added to the core chant of the *Trisagion* ('Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us') the words 'who was crucified for us'.[128] If the hymn had not been part of the theopaschite discourse up to that date, it immediately entered it. Reaction differed in the East, depending on whether the hymn was understood to apply to Christ or to the Trinity. The revised version took root among the miaphysites of Antioch, who thought it applied to Christ alone and for whom it became a symbol of resistance. Chalcedonians in the East, including the Church of Constantinople, interpreted it as applying to the Trinity, and strongly objected to the implication that God in his divinity had died. [129] Ostensibly, this was an internal eastern issue that had little to do with Roman Church but the forged letters show a pope demonstrating leadership on a doctrinal issue in the East.

Purportedly, Pope Felix III sent the first letter (*CA* 71) and the remaining authors, four eastern and three Italian bishops, followed his lead.[130] The pope accused Peter the Fuller 'of introducing novelty to the catholic Church in saying that Christ did not suffer for us, but you attribute suffering to a God who does not suffer and death to the immortal Spirit'.[131] He also accused him of following the heretics Samostenus and Nestorius in dividing one son into a duality of sons.[132] Each of the remaining seven letters follows Felix's line of argument although they differ to some degree in content and tone. Two of the Italian bishops explicitly referred to pope in terms that recognised his authority on the issue. Bishop Quintianus of Asculani mentioned many bishops denouncing Peter, 'especially the very holy pope Felix'; he ends the letter with the warning that Pope Felix will condemn him.[133] Bishop Justin of the province of Sicily advised Peter to follow the advice of the pope.[134] One of the eastern bishops, Pamphilus of Abydos in Asia Minor, referenced Felix differently. He reported the Roman bishop asking Acacius, the archbishop of Constantinople: 'Why do you lay waste the Church? Why do you scatter the sheep of Christ?'[135] Collectively, the letters show Pope Felix leading on a doctrinal issue, with bishops from both West and East prepared to follow. Even if these letters were

[127] Grillmeier, *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, p. 257.
[128] V.L. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church,* Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford, 2008), p. 167.
[129] Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church,* pp. 168-69.
[130] The Italian bishops were purportedly from [Asculani]in the province of Sicily and [Arsenoa]. The eastern bishops, were stated to be from sees in Greece, Thrace and two cities in Asia Minor.
[131] *CA*. 71.2: 'inferre putaveris ecclesiae catholicae novitatem, ut non propter nos Christum crucifixum dicas, sed passionem impassibili deo iniquissime intulisti et et immortali spiritui mortem adponere praesumpsisti'.
[132] *CA* 71.5: 'dixisti sicut Samosatenus et Nestorius unum filium dividentes in divinitatem filiorum.'
[133] *CA* 72.1 and 16: 'multis tibi episcopis denuntiantibus … maxime papa Felice' and 'alioquin veniet super te Felicis papae nostri damnatio'.
[134] *CA* 73.2: 'pare, karissime, Felicis adhortationibus'.
[135] *CA* 76.7: 'Acacio … (illum autem pontifex Romanus, omnes (sic) vero omnium episcopus Christus) … cur vastas ecclesiam? cur Christi dispergis ovilia?'

forged, their rhetorical impact in the context of the *Collectio* is not lessened. The compiler's underlying assertion is supported by a further example of papal leadership on doctrine.

Pope Gelasius I on Pelagianism

It is difficult to explain the inclusion of four documents on Pelagianism in Section 3(c) other than by suggesting that the compiler wished to show a pope, Gelasius I, demonstrating leadership and competence in theology, and that in attacking the heresy he was fulfilling his primatial responsibilities. The documents comprise a letter to bishops in Picenum entitled 'Against the Pelagian heresy' (*CA* 94), a tract on Pelagianism (*CA* 97) and two letters to Honorius, a bishop in Dalmatia (*CA* 96 and 98). Arguably, there was an intended read-across to letters in Section 2 which touch on the condemnation of Pelagius in 417-18. However, as I argue above, the purpose of Section 2 was to provide examples of prelates changing their minds. *CA* 94 and 97 show Gelasius's theological expertise. In the letter, Gelasius primarily addressed three Pelagian positions: the denial of original sin, the unlikely damnation of an unbaptised child, and the conferment of grace according to man's merits.[136] The tract occupies some thirty-six pages in the CSEL volume.[137] In both these documents Gelasius argued the underlying case by reference to scriptural, not papal, authority.

I suggest that *CA* 96 and 98 were included to make clear that, in leading the attack on the heresy, Gelasius was fulfilling his primatial responsibilities. In *CA* 96 Gelasius briefly referred to his 'care for all the churches'; he tells Honorius: 'We are amazed that your Love was amazed that the care of the apostolic see, which by the custom of the fathers is owed to all churches throughout the world, and which has been anxious also for the faith of your region … because certain men are striving to impair the catholic unity through Dalmatia and to inflict anew the poison of the Pelagian disease which has previously been damned by divine and human laws'.[138] In the later letter, Gelasius referred to the recurrence of Pelagianism in Dalmatia and stated that he was hardly able to breathe, given the weight of his primatial responsibilities: 'for the governance of the apostolic see, we manage without cease the care of the entire sheepfold of the Lord, which had been delegated to Peter by our Saviour who said: "strengthen your brothers" … and "Peter, do you love me? Feed my sheep". We cannot and ought not disregard what form touches on our care'.[139] It is likely that these two letters were intended make a

[136] *CA* 94.
[137] *CA* 97.
[138] *CA* 96.1: 'Miramur dilectionem tuam fuisse miratam curam sedis apostolicae, quae more maiorum cunctis per mundum debetur ecclesiis, pro vestrae quoque regionis fide fuisse sollicitam, cumque ad eam perlatum esset, quod quidem per Dalmatias integritam catholicam vitiare niterentur et divinis humanisque legibus ante damnatum Pelagianae pestilentiae denuo virus inferre'.
[139] *CA* 98.1: 'pro sedis tamen apostolicae moderamine totius ovilis dominici curam sine cessassione tractantes, quae beato Petro salvatoris ipsius nostri voce delegata est: et tu conversus confirma tfratres tuos, et item: Petre, amas me? Pasce oves meas! Dissimulare nec possumus nec debemus, quae nostrum sollicitudinem forma perstringat'.

connection in the reader's mind between Gelasius's leadership and competence in theology (reflected in *CA* 94 and 97) and primacy.

I consider that the four documents in the subsection on Pelagianism should be linked with those letters which emphasise Leo's leadership and success at Chalcedon and Felix III's supposed leadership against Peter the Fuller's interpolation in the *Trisagion*. Apart from demonstrating their leadership, I suggest that the compiler considered it important to emphasise the theological credentials of at least a few Roman bishops to support their claims to be the final arbiters of orthodox doctrine. Notwithstanding Pope Leo I's Tome, the Roman Church did not have a strong theological tradition, a position that potentially undermined its claim.[140] Gelasius was unusual in that he wrote tracts, of which *CA* 97 was one. The *Liber Pontificalis* reported that he produced five books against Nestorius and Eutyches, two books against Arius, as well as tracts and hymns, and prefaces and prayers.[141] Collectively, the references to Leo and Chalcedon, the letters of Felix III and the other bishops, and the four documents on Pelagianism are a form of assertion of doctrinal primacy. The latter documents also appear in a subsection in which other letters of Gelasius reveal a new claim to jurisdictional primacy, the right of the bishop of Rome to determine membership of the Christian community.

*Jurisdictional Primacy: Control of the '*Communio'

I argue that the *Collectio* also evidenced the development and assertion of a new expression of jurisdictional primacy, the right of the bishop of Rome to determine membership of the wider Christian community, a power which was a direct outcome of the events of 476 and 482. The right was founded on 'power to bind and loose' in Matthew 16:19, rather than on Christ's statement to Peter in the earlier verse (Matthew 16:18) that he was the rock on which he would establish the Church. As I show, awareness of this right emerged in the Acacian schism when popes had to explain the excommunication of Acacius and the other eastern patriarchs. A comparison of the records of the synods of Rome of 485 and 498 shows how this thinking developed. Consideration of the power promoted a new, or a revived, discourse on *communio*, the conceptual framework within which it would operate. This power was to be tested on two occasions: Pope Hormidas's attempt to settle the Acacian schism on terms which required the exclusion of names of eastern prelates from diptychs, and Justinian's requests, in the negotiations over the theopaschite formula, that popes condemn the Acoimetae monks, who had opposed the edict that the emperor had issued in 533 proclaiming the formula. The

[140] Leo I was the only pope to be mentioned by Pope Martin I at the Lateran Synod of 649 in a list of twelve 'fathers and teachers of the church' whom he 'followed'. See R. Price, P. Booth and C. Cubitt (eds.), *Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649*, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 61 (Liverpool, 2014), p. 305.
[141] *LP* 51.6.

compiler shows the strength and weakness of this power in the negotiation over the theopaschite formula.

The reports of the Roman synods of 485 and 495 show a change in the invocation of Matthew 16. As I discuss above, the reports appear at the end of what I identify as Section 3(a) and Section 3(c). At the earlier synod, Bishops Misenus and Vitalis, papal delegates who had been suborned by Acacius in Constantinople, were excommunicated, and the excommunications of Acacius and the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch were confirmed. At the later synod, Misenus was rehabilitated but the others were not. The report of the synod of 485 was addressed to 'all priests and orthodox archimandrites in Constantinople and Bithynia'; we do not know to whom the report of the later synod was addressed but, as I explain below, it was probably also addressed to eastern clergy, not least because of the message it contained. The account of the earlier synod asserted three conventional bases of papal authority in a few closely packed lines: 'this custom is retained: the successor of the chief priests of the apostolic see, from within the assembly of all priests in the entirety of Italy, decides everything according to his appropriate care of all churches. He is the head of all, [due to] our Lord's statement to Peter: "you are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it"'.[142] The report of the later synod does not repeat any of these expressions but instead, refers to 'the power to bind and loose' in Matthew 16:19.[143] The section's organisation suggests that the reader was expected to notice this change.

Gelasius' thinking on Matthew 16:18-19 changed between 485 and 495. He clearly spent some time considering the application of the mandate to the excommunications of Acacius and the others, as he wrote the tract *Tomus de anathematis vinculo* and discussed it a later letter (*CA* 101) and the change is reflected in the report of the synod of 495 (*CA* 103).[144] Critically, although it reflects later thinking than is in the tract, he came to the conclusion that the power to bind and loose could not be exercised on the deceased; God had retained that power for himself: 'he therefore reserved those who are certainly not now upon the earth, not for human judgement, but for his own'.[145]

I suggest that this thinking was driven by a need to explain to explain the excommunication of Acacius, as the archbishop of Constantinople was held in high regard in the East and the pope had not called a council to judge him. Particularly significant are Gelasius's *Epistula* 1, *CA*

[142] *CA*. 70.9: 'haec consuetudo retinetur, ut successor praesulum sedis apostolicae ex persona cunctorum totius Italiae sacerdotum iuxta sollicitudinem sibi ecclesiarum omnium conpetentem cuncta constituat, qui caput est omnium domino ad beatum Petrum apostolum dicente: tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam'.
[143] *CA* 103.27: 'quaecumque ligaveris super terram, ligata erunt et in caelis et quaecumque solveris super terram, erunt solute et in caelis'.
[144] *Tractatus IV seu Tomus de anathematis vinculo, Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum,* pp. 557-70.
[145] *CA* 103.28: 'quos ergo non esse iam constat super terram, non humano sed suo iudicio reservavit'; translation by Neil and Allen, *The Letters of Gelasius I*, p. 137.

101(August 494) and *CA* 95 (February or May 496), all of which were addressed to bishops in Dardania or Illyricum. *Epistula* 1 was probably written in 488/9 when Gelasius was still Pope Felix III's deacon; it was not copied into the *Collectio*, but it covers much of the same ground and sheds additional light on the issue.[146] In this early letter Gelasius worked through the consequences of absolving Acacius, Misenus and Vitalis, all of whom were alive at the time. In that letter he held out the prospect of removing the binding sentence on Acacius, if his 'evil-doing and transgression' disappeared.[147] The position was very different after Acacius and Vitalis had died. In *CA* 101 Gelasius explained to the bishops of Dardania and Illyricum why Acacius could not be absolved: 'he died still with that same conviction and, now that he is dead, he cannot obtain that absolution which, when alive, he neither sought nor merited. Indeed, Christ delegated to his apostles saying "what you bind on earth will be bound in heaven". For the rest, it is not lawful for us to decide anything about him'.[148]

We cannot not know for certain who the intended recipients of the report of the synod of 495 were but it is very likely that they were members of the eastern clergy. The design of the section, with sub-sections (a) and (c) ending with synodal reports, with common subject matter in the reports, and with the earlier report known to have been addressed to all priests and archimandrites in Constantinople and Bithynia, lends support to this suggestion. The different treatment of Misenus and Acacius, as discussed at the synod, further suggests that the purpose of the report was to advise eastern clerics that they should reconcile with the Roman Church while they still could, that is while they were still alive. Far from being an act of weakness and a departure from Gelasius's usual hard line towards the East, as George Demacopoulos argues, the pope's absolution of Misenus, coupled with his argument that he could not absolve Acacius post-mortem, was a strong power-play at an important moment in the schism.[149]

The letters identified above and the reports of the synods show that schism and the excommunications spawned a discourse on '*communio*'. All but one of the letters/reports discuss the excommunication of Acacius; two refer to the power to bind and loose.[150] In Table

---

[146] Gelasius, *Ep*. 1, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum,* pp. 287-311. Neil and Allen, *The Letters of Gelasius I,* p. 81, note that the internal evidence suggests that this letter can be dated no later than 488 or 489.

[147] Gelasius, *Ep*. 1.30, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum,* p. 303: 'quae praevaricatio, quod maleficium si recedat, iam non erit illa persona, in quam sententiam insolubilem proferre sum visus'.

[148] *CA* 101.8: 'in hac eadem persistens damnatione defunctus est, absolutionem, quam superstes nec quaesivit omnino nec meruit, mortuus iam non potest impetrare; siquidem ipsis apostolis Christi voce delegatum est quae ligaveritis super terram et quae solveritis super terram. Ceterum iam de eo, qui in divino est iudicio constitutes, nobis fas aliud non est decernere'.

[149] Demacopoulos, *The Invention of Peter,* pp. 80-83, considers that the absolution of Misenus exemplifies his thesis that the rhetoric of papal authority was loudest at moments of weakness in that that the acclamations and new exalted titles for Gelasius at the end of the account of the synod were inserted for the 'explicit purpose of masking what would otherwise have been understood to have been a humiliation for the pontiff' (quote p. 83).

[150] The one exception is *CA* 79; the two which mention the power to bind and loose are *CA* 101 and 103.

3.3, I place the documents in chronological order and show the frequency with which the term *communio* and associated words (*communicare, communicator*) and expressions (*communio catholica* and *fides et communio catholica et apostolica*) appear. Leaving aside *Epistula* 1, each of the letters/reports in the *Collectio* contains a number of references to the terms and expressions. *Communio apostolica et catholica, communio catholica and communio* apostolica were used to refer to communion with the apostolic see, while *communio externa, communicator* and *communio haerticorum* designate associations of heretics. *Communio* on its own can refer to either category.

Table 3.3 References to '*Communio*' and related expressions.

	CA 70	*Ep.* 1.	*CA* 79	*CA* 101	*CA* 103	*CA* 95
	Report of the Synod of Rome	Letter to the bishops of the East	Letter to the bishops of Dardania	Letter to the Bishops of Dardania and Illyricum	Report of the Synod of Rome	Letter to the Dardanians
	October 485	488 or 489	493	August 494	May 495	February or May 496
communio	1	32	3	4	3	26
communicare	1	36	1	1		15
communicator				1	3	5
communio catholica		10	1	3		6
communio catholica et apostolica				2	5	2
fides et communio	2					
fides [et] communio catholica	6					5
fides, [et] communio apostolica et catholica					1	10
communio externa						7
communio haereticorum						1
TOTAL	2	86	5	11	13	76
Number of lines for each letter	131	773	87	106	310	644
Average number of lines per reference	65.5	9.3	17.4	9.6	23.84	9.2

A comparison of the *Ep.* 1 and *CA* 95 shows some development in the discourse over the short period: in the later letter the connection of *fides* with *communio catholica* is extended to include *apostolica,* and there is a more pronounced definition of the heretical communion (particularly *communio externa*). The significant expression '*fides, [et] communio apostolica et catholica'* embodies, I consider, Gelasius' attempt to assert that the *communio* with the catholic and apostolic Roman see was defined by faith.[151]

I suggest that what we see up to c.496 are the components of a new power to determine membership of the Christian community: Pope Gelasius at the centre of the Christian communion refusing to absolve Acacius; the change in way that Matthew 16:18-19 was invoked, with a new focus on the 'power to bind and loose'; and the development in the discourse on *communio*. This is most apparent in the report of the synod of 495: the report showed a pope determining who could be a member of the community, the first articulation of a new power. However, the Roman Church had little or no means of independently enforcing this power; its effectiveness depended on the desire of churches and rulers to be in communion with Rome. That condition was to be satisfied when the Emperor Justin I (518-27) decided to settle the Acacian schism and re-establish communion. We see the power to determine membership of the Christian community put into effect when Pope Hormisdas (514-23), at the close of the schism, insisted on having names removed from diptychs. This was a short-lived triumph for the Roman Church, but the exchanges over the theopaschite formula in 534 and 536 show that the principle of papal control over membership of the Christian community had been established.

Pope Hormisdas's insistence at the settlement of the Acacian schism that names of certain bishops in the East be removed from the diptychs was a strong assertion of this new power: he required those returning to communion to sign the *libellus* in which they promised 'that the names of those separated from the communion with the catholic church, i.e. those who did not agree with the apostolic see, were not to be recited during the sacred mysteries'.[152] Diptychs held lists of names which were read out and commemorated during the Mass. The names of the dead defined a church's Christian tradition back to its apostolic past, the names of the living declared its communion with other churches. Volker Menze opines that they 'contained in a microcosm the claim of every local church to be part of a long Christian tradition and to be part of the universal Church'.[153] Those required to sign had the greatest difficulty with the requirement to remove the names of the deceased. After a short while the emperor Justin and

[151] This is, for instance expressed as: 'pro fide autem et veritate et communione catholica atque apostolica' — *CA* 95.33.
[152] *CA*. 116b.4: 'promittentes etiam sequestratos a communione ecclesiae catholicae, id est non consentientes sedi apostolicae, eorum nomina inter sacra non recitanda esse mysteria'.
[153] Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church,* pp.76- 89 but particularly pp. 85-86.

his nephew pushed back. In July 520 Justinian wrote that the pope should be content with the removal of the names of Acacius, Peter Mongos, Timothy Aelurus, Dioscorus of Alexandria and Peter the Fuller, but should otherwise abandon the 'inveterate struggle about the names of others'.[154] In September 520 Justin repeated the suggestion, pointing out the level of resistance in the dioceses of Pontus, Asia and Oriens, and noting the impact of the measure: 'the people destroy and reject the names of priests whose reputation flourished among them [when alive]; they judge life harder than death if they have condemned dead men, in whose lives they gloried while they were living'.[155] The application of the condition to the other names faded from sight after this, and was not repeated in the *libelli* of 536. Nevertheless, Hormisdas's requirement was a strong expression of the power to determine membership of the Christian community in this period, which we see again in the exchanges over the theopaschite formula.[156]

As I have discussed above, in 534 and 536 Justinian asked Popes John II and Agapetus to condemn the Acoimetae monks, but in doing so, he implicitly recognised that the pope had the right to determine membership of the Christian community.[157] He requested John II declare that he 'accepts all who rightly confess [Justinian's profession of faith] and condemns the perfidy of those [i.e. the monks], who in Jewish fashion have dared to deny the true faith'.[158] John replied 'If anyone opposes this confession, this [expression of] faith, he has sentenced himself to [be] separated from holy communion (*alienum a sancta communione*), and from the catholic church'. Justinian made the same request to Agapetus: 'Because of this we ask Your Holiness to confirm the letter mentioned and excommunicate (*a communione habeatis alienos*) Cyrus and his like'.[159] The pope replied in similar terms to John after accepting Justinian's profession: 'if anyone of our Catholic faith is tempted to act otherwise, he becomes alien from the holy communion (*sancta communione*)'.[160] Although the popes acceded to the emperor's requests, which almost certainly were signs of weakness, I suggest that on each occasion Justinian was implicitly acknowledging that the pope was the person with the right to determine membership of the communion. I consider that both examples, the diptychs and the monks, show that the principle was established, even if the political realities meant that the power was exercised supinely.

---

[154] *CA* 196.3-4: '… finire dignetur inveteratum certamen de ceterorum niminibus'.
[155] *CA* 232.3: 'ut tollant antistitum et repellent nomina, quorum apud eos floruit, sed morte vitam aestimant, si mortuos condemnaverint, quorum gloriabantur vita superstitum'.
[156] The inconsistency between Hormisdas' position in 519, which required condemning the dead, and Vigilius's refusal to condemn Theodore of Mopsuestia, because he was dead, was not to be lost on Justinian.
[157] See above, pp. 83-84.
[158] *CA* 84.19: 'manifestum nobis facaitis, quod … vestra sanctitas et eorum, qui Iudaice ausi sunt rectam denegare fidem, condemnat perfidiam', and 84.25: 'huic confessioni, huic fidei quisquis contradictor extiterit, alienum se ipse ab ecclesia iudicavit esse catholica'.
[159] *CA* 91.23: 'Quam ob rem petimus sanctitatem vestram, ut memoratam epistolam vestra auctoritate firmetis et Cyrum vel similes eius a communione habeatis alienos';
[160] *CA* 91.4, quoted above, p. 84, n. 77.

In summary, we see in the *Collectio* two formulations of papal authority and primacy which, I consider, emerged in the special circumstances that prevailed after 476 and 482, but which refreshed components that had been apparent in earlier centuries of the Church. The first was an assertion of papal leadership on doctrine, founded on the real success of Pope Leo at Chalcedon, supplemented by compiler's presentation of the examples of Felix III and Gelasius I leading on a doctrinal issue. I consider that this articulation was a direct response to the imperial challenge that started with Zeno's *Henotikon*, but it also strongly echoes the examples of papal leadership on doctrinal leadership that I discuss in Chapters 1 and 2. In addition, a new interpretation of the 'power to bind and loose' emerged in the Acacian schism, the right of the bishop of Rome to determine membership of the Christian *communio*. This development owed much to the need of successive popes to explain the excommunication of Acacius and the other eastern patriarchs. However, I suggest that it also needs to be understood in terms of conditions prevailing after 476 and that it reflected a re-awakening of the notion that the bishop of Rome was the centre of the *communio*. As I discuss in Chapter 1, Ludwig Hertling has observed in regard to the earlier centuries 'the basic function of the pope was not the performance of given official actions, but simply being present as the fundamental point of orientation and unity'.[161] Hertling describes a role with limited or no power. I suggest that the loss of much of the support structure after 476 and the way that Acacian schism developed and refreshed the importance of the notion of *communio* with the bishop of Rome at the centre; the discourse generated resulted in a considerable focus on the Christian communion. The bishop of Rome's role, as described by Hertling, acquired some traction and force due to the grafting on of the power to bind and loose.

Part 4: Roman Church – Empire Relations

I argue that the third objective of the compiler of the *Collectio Avellana* was to opine on Church-Empire relations in a way that was part polemic, part disquisition. As I show, some of the content is a strong polemic against emperors' involvement in doctrinal issues, almost certainly addressing the situation that pertained after the condemnation of the Three Chapters. However, the compiler did not completely dismiss emperors' involvement in the Church: as I show below, he suggested roles for them in ensuring compliance with the Church's decisions and in adjudicating disputed papal elections. The entirety of these views is contained in one intricately constructed section (Section 1, letters *CA* 1-40). Although he relies heavily on historic examples to make his case, I suggest that in regard to imperial interventions on

[161] Hertling, Communio, pp. 10 and 52-76.

doctrinal matters and compliance he had contemporary situations very much in mind. He may have included the documents on double elections for a sense of balance, in what appears at times to be a disquisition on Church-Empire relations, or because he considered them to be an ongoing problem. I consider that the mere fact of this content shows that the Roman Church had acquired its own detached identity and it had become necessary to re-think and map out the relationship with secular rulers

Imperial Interventions in Defining Doctrine and Compliance

The arguments against imperial interventions in doctrine are to be found in the first and fourth subsections of Section 1. The first (*CA* 1-2) comprises the *Praefatio* and the second letter known as the *Libellus quorumdam schismaticorum*, a petition from Luciferian priests addressed to Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius, emperors whom they considered orthodox. In certain respects, the *Libellus* is a curious entry in the *Collectio* as its authors were Luciferians who, by the 360s, were no longer considered orthodox.[162] However, it complements the *Praefatio* and it additionally contains a minor argument to which it was very likely that the compiler subscribed. The fourth subsection (*CA* 38-40) encompasses three letters written by emperors (Honorius to his younger brother Arcadius, and Magnus Maximus to the emperor Valentinian II, and separately to Pope Siricius).

I argued in Part 2 above that the compiler intended the *Praefatio* to signal that the *Collectio* was a defence of Vigilius; I consider that he also intended the letter to be an argument against the involvement of emperors in defining doctrine. I suggest that this intention is also apparent in the *Libellus* but this latter document is longer and its argument against too close an association of Church and Empire is wider and more explicit. The structure of both letters is similar: the first part introduces a position resulting from the emperor Constantius's involvement in a church council; the second part details its consequences. The *Praefatio* narrates the condemnation of Athanasius of Alexandria, the main opponent of the emperor's religious policy, at the Council of Milan (355) and the consequent exiling of Pope Liberius, the election of Pope Felix II in his place, and the consequent schism when their respective supporters elected Ursinus and Damasus.[163] In the *Libellus* the Luciferian priests recounted their experiences under a number of emperors but they mostly commented on events under Constantius, whom they considered an Arian and the 'patron of heretics'.[164] They complained that, although they were orthodox, they were treated as heretics.[165] They narrated the outcomes of the joint councils of Ariminium and Seleucia Isauriae in 359, which Constantius engineered**.**

[162] On the Luciferians' departure from orthodoxy see Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, pp. 116-17, 125 and 155-58.
[163] *CA* 1.1-2 and 1.5.
[164] *CA* 2.51.
[165] *CA* 2.4: 'dum ostendimus non nos esse haereticos et tamen quasi haereticos vehementer adfligi'.

In their assessment, bishops 'reproved the pious faith of their fathers, which they had [previously] championed and subscribed to the faith of the Arians which they had condemned with an unfettered and free judgement'.[166] Most of the second part of the petition is taken up with details of a series of conflicts between bishops, notably between nine orthodox prelates (seven bishops and two priests) and eight others.[167]

The *Libellus* was a sharper critique of imperial involvement and made two points which the compiler may have considered applied the Second Council of Constantinople: the damaging effect of imperial control of the episcopate and the danger of surrendering truth for 'peace'. The Luciferians identified imperial patronage as an issue: 'since [the bishops] fear the anger of the king, since they are not worthy to suffer exile for the son of God, and since they are delighted by their own sees and by the pernicious possessions of the churches, they annulled what they had piously claimed, and they accepted what they had condemned as impious'.[168] They also complained that 'impiety is hidden under the language of peace and the splendid name of unity is put to the defence of dishonest men'.[169] Almost all the attendees at Council of Constantinople that condemned the Three Chapters were eastern bishops.[170] The beginning of the Second *Constitutum*, the document in which Vigilius formally reversed his defence of the Chapters, is lost but comments in later sections of the record reveal that he yielded for the peace of the Church: 'Having exhausted what needed to be expounded or defined in order to put to rest the question of the first chapter … it is incumbent on us to explain what the logic of ecclesiastical unity and the care of the faith handed down by the holy fathers require to be done about Theodore of Mopsuestia and his statements'.[171] Here 'peace' is expressed as 'ecclesiastical unity'. I suggest the pertinence of these points would not have been lost on contemporary readers.

In addressing the emperors, the Luciferian priests recognised that the rulers were given power by God, and that they had responsibility for the 'pious faith'. The state 'was handed over to [their] power by the will of God'.[172] They discharged their responsibilities by enacting laws

---

[166] *CA* 2.18: 'piam fidem patrum, quam vindicaverant, reprobant subscribentes in illa fide Arrianorum, quam integro et libero iudicio damnaverant'. *CA* 2.14-25 for coverage of the councils.
[167] *CA* 2. Included in these conflicts are: Osius of Cordoba against Gregory of Eliberitana (paras. 33-41); the illustrious bishops Luciosus and Hyginus against a Spanish priest Vincent (73-77); Pope Damasus against Macarius (78-82); Damasus against Ephesius (83-85); the illustrious bishop Theodorus against Paul (93-95); bishop Turbo against the Luciferians (106-110).
[168] *CA* 2. 16: 'nunc minis perterret et interim sola dilatione discruciat, ut in ultimum, cum iram regis metuunt, cum non dignantur pro Christo filio dei exilium perpeti. Com propriis sedibus et ecclesiarum perniciosissimis possessionibus oblectantur, rescindant, quod pie vindicaverant, et suscipiant, quod impium damnaverant'.
[169] *CA* 2.57: 'sub vocabulo pacis impietas tegitur et speciosum nomen unitatis opponitur ad patrocinium'.
[170] Of 170 bishops (of whom 152 attended) 12 were from Illyricum and so nominally under papal jurisdiction, 11 from Italy, 8 from Northern Africa. See Price, *Acts of the Council of Constantinople*, vol. 1, pp. 27-28.
[171] Vigilius, Second *Constitutum* in Price, *Acts of the Council of Constantinople*, vol. 2, para. 151, p.264.
[172] *CA* 2.2: 'tradita vestro imperio dei nutu … res publica'.

against heretics and evil men, and not by 'trying anything new, in particular new ways of thinking, as certain earlier emperors have done in their destruction of others but in order that you may show that your judgements and your pious faith are in conformity with the opinions of divine scripture and pious confessions'.[173]

The fourth subsection is notable for statements by emperors on the Church-Empire relations and it echoes the main themes of the first. Honorius's letter to his nephew and co-emperor Arcadius was written following a slaughter which immediately preceded the deposition of John Chrysostom in 404. He declared: 'the interpretation of divine matters falls to [priests], compliance in religion falls to us.'[174] Magnus Maximus, a usurper in the West (383-88) and staunch pro-Nicene, authored the other two letters. The context of the first was Valentinian II's move towards Arianism under his mother's influence.[175] Echoing the message of the first subsection that involvement led to discord, he reproached Valentinian as 'force has been inflicted on catholic churches with new edicts of your clemency, priests have been besieged in churches and the most sacred law has been overturned by I know not whose legislation'.[176] In a way that resonates with the complaint of Luciferian priests in the *Libellus* about their treatment as heretics, Maximus stated 'as a result of so great a change, those who were previously priests, are now judged impious. Indeed, devoted to the same commands and the same sacraments, they believe in the same faith that they previously did'.[177]

Maximus's letter to Pope Siricius was written following the execution of Priscillian and six of his associates, the first Christians known to have been executed for heresy in Late Antiquity.[178] The executions were replete with significance for Church-Empire relations. A synod at Saragossa in 380 had declared Priscillian and a few others to be heretics and excommunicated them. However, a secular judicial process was subsequently superimposed when Priscillian appealed to the emperor Gratian's court and, later, Bishop Ithacius, one of the former's early prosecutors, invoked the aid of Maximus and the subsequent charge became the secular one of sorcery.[179] The executions were authorised by Maximus and opposed by Ambrose of Milan,

---

[173] *CA* 2.2: 'pro fide catholica decernitis et omni nisu contra haereticos et perfidos imperii vestri auctoritate conscribitis, non quasi aliqua propriae sententiae nova temptantes, sicut quidam anteriores principes in suam aliorumque perniciem conati sunt, sed ut ostendatis vestras sententias vestramque piam fidem cum sacris scripturarum divinarum sententiis et piis confessionibus convenire'.
[174] *CA* 38.4: 'ad illos [antistites] enim divinarum rerum interpretation, ad nos religionis spectat obsequium'.
[175] H. Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society*, p. 370.
[176] *CA* 39.3: 'audio enim ……. novis clementiae tuae edictis ecclesiis catholicis vim illatam fuisse, obsideri in basilicis sacerdotes …… legem sanctissimam sub nomine nescio cuius legis everti'.
[177] *CA* 39.5: 'quae tanta mutatio, ut, qui antea sacerdotes, nunc sacrilege iudicentur? Isdem certe praeceptis, isdem sacramentis dicati eadem fide credunt, qua ante crediderunt'.
[178] W. Löhr. 'Western Christianities' in A. Casiday and F.W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity, Vol. 2: Constantine to c. 600* (Cambridge, 2007), p. 39; J. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and the Imperial Court AD 364-425* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 166-67.
[179] H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford, 1976), pp. 40-46 and 126-32.

Martin of Tours and Pope Siricius. Ambrose refused to be in communion with bishops seeking the death of anyone, even heretics.[180] According to Sulpicius Severus, Martin objected on three grounds: it was wrong for a bishop to prosecute anyone on a capital charge; following the synodal judgement and excommunications, it was sufficient for the secular arm to expel them from their churches; charges against bishops should be heard by bishops, not by a secular tribunal.[181] Siricius's letter, to which *CA* 40 is a reply, no longer survives but Chadwick suggested his complaints would have been the same as Martin's first and third objections.[182] Maximus's letter does not bring these issues to the surface; nor does it indicate that his intervention, in Sulpicius's view, resulted in 15 years of conflict between Spanish bishops, a point which would have echoed the messages in *CA* 1-2.[183] Instead, the parallel that the compiler appears to have wished to make is to be taken directly from the text of the letter. Maximus's assertion that 'we declare it to be a matter of mind and will for us that the catholic faith remains uninjured, inviolate and with all dissention driven away, and with all priests agreeing and in unanimity serving God' is a statement of an imperial duty to protect the faith, which partly matches the Luciferians' acknowledgement in the *Libellus* that rulers had responsibility for enacting laws against heresy and that the views of the emperors should reflect scripture.[184] The compiler may also have appreciated Maximus's answer on another point that appears to have been raised in Siricius's letter, the apparently inappropriate promotion of the Gallic cleric Agroecius to the priesthood. Maximus replied that he would leave this to the priests to judge: 'what greater reverence can I show to our religion than catholic priests judge

[180] Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii* 19, quoted by Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila,* pp. 133-34.
[181] Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicles* II, 50.2, in *Sulpicius Severus: The Complete Works,* trans. with introduction and notes by R.J. Goodrich, Ancient Christian Writers No. 70 (New York, 2015), p. 179. Otherwise as summarised by Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila,* p. 138.
[182] Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila,* pp. 147.
[183] Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicles* II, 51.5.
[184] *CA* 40.3: 'ut fides catholica procul omni dissentione summota concordantibus universis sacerdotibus et unanimiter deo servientibus illaesa et inviolabilis perserveret'. For the parallel with the Luciferians see p. 104 and n. 173. The compiler's selection of this letter with the quote affirming imperial responsibility for compliance, without any suggestion of limitations on that duty, probably reflects Sulpicius's attribution of blame for the executions to discord among the bishops and his positive view of Maximus which seems to have had a lasting influence. Of the bishops he stated: 'it can be seen that everything was stirred up and mixed up by disturbance among the bishops, and because of them, everything was corrupted by hatred or prestige, fear, inconstancy, envy, factionalism, pleasure, avarice, arrogance, somnolence and inactivity' (*Chronicles* II, 51.5, *Complete Works*, p. 181). Sulpicius saw Maximus as a good man led astray by episcopal advisers (*Dialogues* III, 11.2, *Complete Works*, p. 240). This fairly positive view of Maximus was to last: some thirty years after the event Jerome was to regard Priscillian's execution as an entirely justified intervention by a secular authority in a religious issue — see Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and the Imperial Court,* p. 167; see also Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avilla,* p. 121. Escribano Paño, 'Maximus' Letters in the *Collectio Avellana*', p. 80, argues that both Maximus's letters defended non-intervention on the side of emperors, and made the case that the latter were to abide by the resolutions of councils. However, while this interpretation can be applied to *CA* 39, I consider that *CA* 40 was included to argue for a compliance role for emperors in the Church.

such matters?'[185] This deference to priests' or to the Church's judgement is also suggested in the letters which the compiler selected to narrate the double elections of 366 and 418.

Contested Papal Elections

A common thread running the letters which comprise the second and third subsections (*CA* 4-13 and *CA* 14-37) is the illustration of acceptable engagement by emperors in the difficult issue of double elections in the Roman Church. The former set of letters shows emperors fulfilling a compliance role after members of the Church had decided their candidate; the latter set presents as an example of an acceptable imperial involvement in an election, one in which the emperor acted as a facilitator rather than as a selector or arbitrator.[186]

The letters *CA* 4-13 do not concern the choice between Damasus and Ursinus, rather they narrate the continuing compliance issues after Damasus had been established as pope.[187] Perhaps to underline this point, in an early letter, chronologically out of sequence and the second in the subsection, an emperor rejoiced in the Roman people's choice of Siricius as Damasus's successor.[188] The other letters reflect a concern with public order following Damasus's election. In *CA* 6, on account of a fear for public safety (*pro publica securitate*), the emperors Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian ordered the remaining church in Ursinian hands to be handed over to Damasus.[189] In *CA* 8 and 9, to avoid discord in the city, the emperors instructed the Urban Prefect, and later the *vicarius*, that Ursinians should not meet within twenty miles of the city. Subsequently, after referring to the restrictions imposed on the followers of Ursinus, the three emperors instructed the Urban Prefect that 'if anyone of those mentioned thought that the decree of our clemency was to be transgressed by impious intent, he will [have cause to] recognise the severity of public censure, not as a Christian, but as a person remote from the reason of law and religion'.[190] A year later, the emperors repeated the message: the severity of the law would follow such a person 'not as a Christian … but as a revolutionary,

[185] *CA* 40.2 'quid religioni nostrae catholicae possum praestare reverentius, quam ut de hoc ipso … catholici iudicent sacerdotes?'
[186] In using the term 'facilitator' I follow G.D. Dunn, 'Imperial Intervention in the Disputed Roman Episcopal Election of 418/19' in *Journal of Religious History*, 39(1) (2015), p.12.
[187] *CA* 3 is an anomaly in the subsection in that it relates to the construction of St Paul's, but the compiler may have intended to flag up another imperial role, that of patrons of major constructions for such a great religion (*pro tantae religionis meritis*) (*CA* 3.3).
[188] *CA* 4 is dated February 385 and is from an unnamed emperor to the Urban Prefect Pinianus (Prefect 385-7). He rejoices in the choice by the people of the best candidate of their church: 'Populum urbis aeternae gaudere concordia et optimum eligere sacerdotem et populi Romani esse cernimus instituti et nostris gratulamur id evenire temporibus'. (*CA*. 4.1.). *CA* 5-13 are in chronological order and cover the period 367-79. *CA* 3 is dated to 386.
[189] *CA* 6.
[190] *CA* 11.3: 'quod sib quispiam ex memoratis sacrilege intentione statutum mansuetudinis nostrae transgrediendum putaverit, non iam ut Christianus sed ut legume ac religionis ratione seclusus severitatem publicae animadversionis agnoscat'.

as a disturber of the public peace and an enemy of religion and law'.[191] In the final letter of this subsection, the emperors put the weight of the state behind Pope Damasus and the Church: where anyone, condemned by the pope and a council of five or seven bishops, unjustly wishes to keep his church or does not wish to attend a priestly court, the prefects of Gaul and Italy were to ensure attendance before the appropriate episcopal court, or provincial governors or *vicarii* would ensure their appearance in Rome.[192] Collectively, these letters show emperors exercising compliance powers mostly for state purposes but also for ecclesiastical ones.

The Boniface-Eulalius letters (*CA* 14-37) concern an emperor's involvement in the election of a pope and provide an account which is not only uncritical, but which the compiler may have proposed as a paradigm. The letters construct a narrative of the process. The prefect Symmachus, concerned with the public order, reported the double election of Eulalius and Boniface in 418 to the emperor Honorius, and recommended supporting the former. Honorius was inclined to endorse his judgement on the grounds Eulalius had the greater support.[193] However, petitioned by priests who supported Boniface, he held a synod in Ravenna to resolve the issue.[194] Honorius appears to have attempted to leave the choice to members of the Church and to have acted impartially. He instructed the synod '[to] consider the judgement of God because, in such a matter, it is manifest that it resides with you, and it is fitting that, after you have considered everything, you protect it because, with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, it can achieve the true reverence of Christian law'.[195] When the synod proved inconclusive, he appointed a visitor to provide services over Easter, communicated with the Senate and the people, and summoned a wider membership to the council, including Paulinus of Nola, Bishop Aurelius of Carthage and other African bishops.[196] In the event, Eulalius forced his hand by disobeying the order to stay out of Rome and, as a result, Honorius chose Boniface. The final letter in the subsection is a rescript from Honorius to Boniface, prompted by the pope, stating that if two candidates are elected bishop again, both are to be driven from the city.[197]

---

[191] *CA* 12.3: 'qui si … statutum … egrediendum putaverit, eundem, non iam ut Christianus, quippe quem a communione religionis mentis inquietudo disterminat, sed ut hominem factiosum perturbatoremque publicae tranquilitatis legum et religionis inimicum iuris severitas persequatur'.
[192] *CA* 13.11: 'volumus autem, ut, quicumque iudicio Damasi, quod ille cum consilio quinque vel septem habuerit episcoporum, vel eorum qui catholici sint iudicio atque consilio condemnatus erit, si iniuste voluerit ecclesiam retentare … seu ab illustribus viris praefectis praetorio Galliae atque Italiae auctoritate adhibita ad episcopale iudicium remittatur sive a proconsulibus vel vicariis <accitus> ad urbem Romam sub prosecutione perveniat …'
[193] *CA* 14 ,15 and 16.
[194] *CA* 17 and 20.
[195] *CA* 20.4: 'attendentes ergo iudicium dei, quod in tali causa vobiscum simul residere manifestum est, examinatis omnibus id vos custodire decet, quod infudente caelesti spiritu habere Christianae legis integram reverentiam possit'.
[196] *CA* 22-28.
[197] See P.R. Coleman-Norton, note on Rescript of Honorius on Papal Elections, [AD] 420, *Roman State and Christian Church: A Collection of Legal Documents to A.D. 535* (London, 1966), vol. 2, p. 611.

Section 1 thus constitutes a coherent and intricate statement on Church-Empire relations that is also intelligible in terms of events after the Second Council of Constantinople. Structurally, the subsections that opine on emperors' involvement in doctrine bookend those on double elections. The compiler presents a strong argument against secular rulers interfering in doctrinal matters but shows that they have a role in ensuring compliance, in dealing with heretics and adjudicating or facilitating in contested papal elections. Most of the content is understandable in terms of events in the second half of the sixth century. The argument against imperial intervention in doctrine was endorsed by the situation prevailing after the Council when the churches of Milan and Aquileia broke off communion; the Istrian schism was to last until 698. Pelagius I (556-61) and Pelagius II (579-90) called on Byzantine exarchs to fulfil the emperor's compliance role in suppressing opposition to the condemnation of the Three Chapters.[198] I suggest that the Roman Church saw a role for secular rulers in contested elections. It had a constitutional problem with double elections in that it had no canonical or procedural means for resolving them; it was content for secular rulers to intervene, provided they left fundamental elements of choice with the clergy, as was the case in 418-19.[199] Lizzi Testa has recently opined that the documents on the double elections were included as they were regarded as exemplary episodes, and that they appeared very similar to some contemporary electoral crises, particularly the Laurentian schism and the election of 530.[200] I clearly agree with her comment about their exemplary nature but consider their inclusion needs to be understood within the overall framework of a section whose purpose was to opine on Church-Empire relations. It is possible that two subsections owed something to the contested elections of 498 and 530, but I am more inclined to think that Justinian's direct appointment of Pelagius I to the papacy may have driven the selection.[201] I consider that the direct appointment of popes was deeply inimical to notions of Petrine and apostolic succession: the main thrust of Leo I's second sermon, in which the concept of 'unworthy heir' appears, was the pope's joy

[198] Pelagius I, *Epp,* 1-3, *PL* 69, col. 393-398. On Pelagius II, see Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World*, p. 129. Paul the Deacon relates action taken by Smaragdus against the schismatics before 589 in *History of the Lombards*, trans. W.D. Foulke, ed. E. Peters (Philadelphia, 1974), III. 26. Markus, in 'Justinian's Ecclesiastical Politics and the Western Church' in *Sacred and Secular: Studies on Augustine and Latin Christianity* (Aldershot, 1994), VII, p. 9, observes that Gregory I had increasing difficulty in getting the emperor and exarch to take action against the Istrian schismatics as the policy of enforcing religious unity in the reconquered provinces gave way to the need for military control.

[199] I show in Chapter 2 that the authors of the *Liber Pontificalis* took a similar view on Theoderic the Great's initial handling of the double election of Symmachus and Laurence in 498. See Chapter 2, p. 62.

[200] Lizzi Testa, 'Introduction' in *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals*, p. xv.

[201] I am not aware that there was any element of nomination in the 366 election. Damasus and Ursinus were elected by the followers of Felix II and Liberius respectively. J. Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy*, p. 96, discusses nominations. He points out that Pope Hilarus in 465 prohibited bishops from nominating successors, which might imply that popes nominated before that date but I consider that doubtful. Richards does not provide an example before 483. Boniface I's attempt to avoid a disputed election involved imperial intervention, not a nomination.

that he had been selected by God for the role.[202] Appointment by emperors did not sit well with the theology of primacy.

Part 5 The Compiler and his Readership

Very little is known about the compiler but the collection's content, interpreted as I suggest, indicates some of his concerns and his probable status. His defence of doctrinal primacy, his interest in tracing the development of a new form of jurisdictional primacy, his awareness of parallels in the Church's history in the fourth century, and the ecclesiastical content of the *Collectio* point strongly to his clerical status and his membership of the Roman Church. I suggest we can assume that he was a supporter of Pope Vigilius and/or what he stood for. His access to the First *Constitutum* points to him being close to that pope's inner circle. If close, it is possible that he was aware of the Second *Constitutum*, in which Vigilius condemned the Three Chapters but, as with Athanasius's forbearance over Liberius's surrender to Constantius, he may have chosen to ignore it. Alternatively, he may have wanted to support the stance that the First *Constitutum* represented.

As I discuss above, the *Collectio* gives us reasons to think that groups in the Church took different positions on the condemnation of the Three Chapters, and that the compiler identified with the constituency which opposed it. In addition, I think it likely that those who opposed the condemnation also thought that the pope could not bind or loose the sins of the deceased, the core point in Vigilius's defence of Theodore of Mopsuestia in First *Constitutum*. Popes after Vigilius prevaricated for a long time before publicly repeating the condemnation of the Three Chapters: in correspondence Popes Pelagius I and II passed over the Council in silence, simply reaffirming the faith of the four prior ecumenical councils.[203] In a letter issued in the name of Pelagius II between 586 and 590, Gregory the Great accepted the decision of the Council and acknowledged that the dead could be condemned.[204] I consider that it is reasonable to propose the existence of parties taking different positions on the condemnation between the Council and Gregory's letter. I suggest that it is likely that the compiler intended the *Collectio* to circulate among and to appeal to those who did not accept or were doubtful about the condemnation, and that it had a currency of approximately 31-35 years.

---

[202] Leo I, Sermon 2, trans. J.P. Freeland and A.J. Conway, *St Leo the Great Sermons*, The Fathers of the Church Vol 93, (Washington, 1996), pp. 19-20.
[203] Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World*, p.127.
[204] Pelagius II, *Ep.* 5, *PL* 72, cols. 715-38. Gregory referred to the matter of condemning the deceased at *Ep.* 5.9, *PL* 72, cols. 723-24. For the timing of the letter, see above, p. 86, n. 91.

Once we accept that the *Collectio* is a letter collection, I suggest we know a little more about the compiler and the institutional environment in which the more senior members of the clergy operated. He appears to have been familiar with the genre. His use of the genre implies a reasonably high level of education, and that they were one of the mediums through which political debate was conducted within the Roman Church. I suggest that the debate would not simply have been about the condemnation of the Chapters, but would have embraced the related discussions on the appropriateness of condemning the dead and the post-mortem activity of saints which, we know, took place in Constantinople. The compiler gives us the faintest of hints that these debates took place in Rome as well: in part, and in a limited fashion, he tracks the debate from Gelasius to Vigilius. Inter alia, the collection provided the underlying documents to support one side of the debate.

The *Collectio* also suggests that, as with the case of John Lydus in the eastern praetorian prefecture, there were people in the Roman Church, in a tier below the top of the organisation, who promoted the interest of their group while also displaying a strategic awareness of the issues affecting the institution. Chris Kelly has pointed to a need for Lydus to continually reconcile personal advantage and benefits from mutual and cooperative effort. In the compiler's case, I suggest that he promoted the interest of his group by defending Vigilius; he defended the interests of the Church by tracking developments in and promoting primacy. In his assessment of Church-Empire relations, I suggest that he displayed a keen awareness of the deficiencies of his organisation and of factors in the external environment which affected his institution.

Conclusion

The *Collectio Avellana* needs to be understood as a late antique letter collection. Once this hermeneutical key is applied, the collection's structure and the objectives of the compiler become apparent. As a letter collection it is intricate. All five sections of the collection are intelligible in terms of one or more of the objectives that I identify. It is a hybrid episcopal and papal collection, concerned with both the reputation of Vigilius, and tracking developments in and promoting papal authority. It also gives us a rare hint of a major debate within the Church, which we know also took place in Constantinople.

The collection evinces a significant interest in and concern with papal authority and primacy; it shows assertions of primacy in the world after 476. It shows that, in the world after 476, two components of papal authority that I discuss in Chapter 1, came to the fore: demonstrations of leadership and the pope's position at the centre of the Christian *communio*. The compiler's selections show that the Church strongly pressed the success of Leo I and his Tome. The compiler supplemented this by presenting two other examples of papal leadership on doctrine,

those of Felix III and Gelasius I. The development of the new interpretation of the power to bind and loose, the authority of the pope or Roman Church to determine membership of the entire Christian community, was a product of the events of 476 and 482. With the loss of the coercive power and political support of western emperors, the role of the Roman Church as the centre of the *communio* had the potential to resurface. The need to explain the excommunications of Acacius and the other patriarchs led Gelasius to consider the full implications of the power to bind and loose in Matthew 16. By the end of the schism the pope's role at the centre had evolved into his right and power to determine membership of the Christian community. This power was deployed when Hormisdas sought to have names removed from diptychs, and when popes responded to Justinian's request to excommunicate the Acoimetae monks.

The new interpretation calls for a reassessment of the understanding of how papal power operated in late antiquity. Papal authority in this period is primarily perceived in jurisdictional terms, and as weak because the Church had no means of enforcing its claims, other than by persuading compliant secular rulers to help. However, popes had some power. As I state in Chapter I, they had some, non-exclusive, authority in doctrinal matters due to ideas about apostolic tradition, and due to its record for orthodoxy, which Irenaeus was the first to note. Further, the desire to be in communion with Rome gave rise to the role of the bishop of Rome at the centre of the *communio*. These factors were present after 476, and the role of the bishop of Rome at the centre acquired additional force when it came to be expressed as the power to bind and loose.

The findings in this chapter also call into question Demacopoulos's thesis that assertions of papal authority were loudest in moments of weakness. The absolution of Misenus was not, as he argues, an act of weakness. Far from it, sending a report of the Roman synod of 495, which explained why Acacius, now deceased, could not be rehabilitated and restored to communion, was a strong strategic move by the pope during the middle of the schism. The negotiations over acceptance of the theopaschite formula, with both sides (the emperor Justinian and successive popes) managing the interaction between a new formulation of papal authority and imperial power, were grounded in reality. Instead of identifying strong assertions of papal authority and seeking to explain them in terms of the popes' apparently weak positions, more understanding may be achieved by accepting that popes after 476 were in a fundamentally weakened position and seeking to understand why did they exert as much power as they did.

The disquisition on Church-Empire relations in Section 1 of the *Collectio Avellana* was both a reflection of the change in the Church following the demise of western emperors and a vision which saw the Church as an institution functioning in a wider society ruled over by an emperor. The Church-Empire relationship had been significantly called into question, if not fractured by

the double events of 476 and 482. One version of this re-examination was Gelasius's letter to the emperor Anastasius in which he outlined his theory of two powers, the *sacerdotium* (priesthood) and *imperium* (empire). What we see in the *Collectio* is more practical expression of the relationship that was relevant for the Roman Church as an institution. Some historians suggest that the compiler intended to show popes acting independently of imperial intervention, affirming papal independence, or depicting the papacy as a powerful institution.[205] I suggest instead that, doctrinal primacy aside, the selections show a need for imperial involvement in specified areas, and an awareness that the Church was an institution that operated in a society that was ruled over by an emperor.

The *Collectio* potentially gives us an insight into a major internal division in the Church and how such debates were managed. As I show, there was a probable division between those who accepted the condemnation of the Three Chapters and those who did not, a split probably mirrored between those who believed that saints could work miracles and those who were sceptical. I speculate that these debates probably continued in the period 554-585 and the *Collectio* may have provided material to fuel the discussion. If this is the case, it points to a sophisticated working culture in the papal administration in the second half of the sixth century.

[205] Blair-Dixon, 'Memory and authority', pp.69-70; Viezure, '*Collectio Avellana* and the Unspoken Ostrogoths', p. 102; Escribano, 'Maximus' Letters', pp. 76-77.

CHAPTER 4

The Roman Church and Patronage, AD 476-c.600: the Transformation of an Institution

This chapter examines the development of the Roman Church as an institution in the period 476-604 through the prism of patronage. My hypothesis is that the year 476 was highly significant in the Church's development as an institution and, to test this, I compare patterns of patronage before and after that date. My approach is informed by the observations of historical institutionalists who note that the equilibrium of institutions can be disturbed or punctured by external events ('exogenous shocks'), after which they have to adjust and re-stabilise. In 476 the environment of the Church changed. Previously, the Church had been part of western imperial arrangements, if not formally part of the imperial bureaucracy. Critically, in 476 it lost its major patrons, the western emperors and their families. Subsequent rulers in Rome and central Italy, the Herulian Odoacer (476-93) and the Ostrogoth Theoderic (493-526), followed by Justinian and the Byzantine administration (after 536), were not indifferent to the Roman Church but there are questions as to the degree of their patronage, and to the extent that it mattered. There is a supplementary question as to whether western aristocrats, some of whom had been incentivised to follow their emperors' leadership, also ceased to be patrons, or stepped into the breach as opportunities for them opened up in Rome.

In this chapter I argue that the loss of western emperors and their families as patrons mattered to the Church. It was an exogenous shock and triggered transformative changes. I show that other rulers and administrations did not replace western emperors and, arguably, eastern emperors became competitors as they built their own churches in the city. Aristocrats, as a class, had not been wholehearted patrons of the Church before 476; after that date they were even less so as they pursued more local projects. The position of clerics as patrons is not as clear but the indications are that they ceased to be significant patrons as new financial arrangements were put in place as a post-476 response and as, in at least some cases, clerical 'patronage' became payment for position. Popes emerged as the main patrons, a process which, I argue, had a unifying effect on the institution. The focus of papal patronage on major basilicas and cemeteries reveals much about the functions and objectives of the Church. The fact that this strategic focus of patronage started in the pontificates of Sixtus III (432-40) and Hilarus (461-68) does not, in my view, invalidate the year 476 as a turning point; rather it demonstrates the 'stickiness' of behaviour which historical institutionalists categorise as 'path dependence'.

The Institution of the Roman Church

In this thesis I define the Roman Church as the institution that discharged the bishop's pastoral responsibilities *in* Rome. I exclude churches which fell under his wider responsibilities as metropolitan of suburbicarian Italy and patriarch of the West, and consideration of the patrimonies of St Peter, except where the bishop's behaviour in those areas informed the exercise of his patronage in Rome. For the purpose of this chapter, I explain what this means in practice. The institution under consideration therefore comprises four categories of churches and 'basilical monasteries'. The churches include those founded by emperors but liturgically under episcopal control (for instance St Peter's, St Paul's and the Basilica Constantiniana); the 25 or so *tituli* (parish churches) which had evolved by the fifth century to meet the needs of Roman congregations; churches such as the basilica Julii, S. Mariae and S. Stephani in celio monte, which had no resident clergy but had organisational or liturgical functions; and cemeterial basilicas under papal control.[1] We do not know the full position concerning monasteries and convents in Rome, but I include basilical monasteries, those which provided choir services to important Roman basilicas.[2] We know of four, possibly five monasteries or convents in the fifth century, three of which should be considered basilical.[3] For the sixth century Ferrari additionally identifies one definite and two possible basilical monasteries.[4]

I exclude three categories of church or monastery on the grounds that they were not part of the core episcopal function and responsibility: aristocrats' private or estate chapels and churches; those founded by the Byzantine administration after Justinian's reconquest (536-54); and private monasteries. A difficult but important example in the first category is the aristocrat Demetrias's construction and dedication of a church to St Stephen on her estate on the Via Lata. Its mention in the *Liber Pontificalis* implies a level of institutional inclusion and archaeologists have found a baptistry which some historians recognise as an indicator of episcopal pastoral involvement.[5] However, I consider it significant that the church did not

[1] In this chapter and in the thesis, I use the Latin names for churches except for St Peter's, St Paul's and St Laurence's for which there is widespread common English usage. I use 'Basilica Constantiniana' when referring to the church built by Constantine at the Lateran as the more familiar term, 'the Lateran', can be understood as the episcopal palace (episcopium) or the centre of the papal administration.
[2] The definition of 'basilical church' is taken from Guy Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries: Notes for the History of Monasteries and Convents at Rome from the V through the X century,* Studi di antichità Cristiana, no. 23 (Rome, 1978), p. 365.
[3] The three are Pope Sixtus III (432-40)'s foundation In Catacumbas near S. Sebastiani on the Via Appia, Pope Leo I (440-61)'s SS. Iohannis et Pauli at the Vatican, and Pope Hilarus (461-68)'s dedication, probably to St Stephen, near St Laurence's. See Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries,* pp. 163-72 and 315-18.
[4] The definite one is S. Victoris ad S. Pancratium, the possibles are S. Andreae cata Barbara and S. Pancratii in Laterano, the first monastery in the two centuries which may have provided services at the Lateran. See Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries,* pp. 51-57, 242-53 and 341-44.
[5] *LP* 47.1.

become a *titulus* and it appears to have had the character of a dynastic funerary chapel.[6] I agree with Carlos Machado's statement that the case for episcopal control should not be pushed too hard.[7] For different reasons, I exclude churches founded by the Byzantine administration: as I show below, they responded to their own agenda, and probably acted in competition with the Roman Church. No priests from either category of church can be identified in the subscription lists of the Roman synods of 499 and 595, a strong indicator that they were not constituent parts of the Roman Church. I also exclude monasteries such as Gregory I's former home, S. Andreae ad clivum Scauri, which was endowed on a private basis and was not attached to a basilica; although it provided the pope with personnel for his administration, that connection only prevailed in his pontificate.[8]

Patronage

I address patronage that operates in this institutional framework rather than personal patronage. The patronage that I address is that recognised by historians of this period: the construction and provision of buildings; structural alterations, decoration of churches (including mosaics, embellishments and flooring); additional works that are less than buildings (such as baptismal fonts); maintenance and repairs; provision of liturgical furnishings and vessels for services; and any form of funding. Endowments, in the form of gifts of sources of income such as farms or estates, were the paradigm form of funding. The *Liber Pontificalis* details most of these forms of patronage. The patrons under consideration include emperors, kings, aristocrats, other lay people, popes and clergy. By clergy I mean members of the Church other than the bishop (priests, deacons, subdeacons, lectors, etc.,). I exclude from the analysis personal patronage, the form that expresses patron-client relationships, as the sources will not yield relevant information. John Lydus's *On Powers* shows that personal patronage did operate in administrations at the time.[9] However, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to tease out these relationships from the extant Roman ecclesiastical sources.[10]

---

[6] It had the tomb of Sextus Anicius Paulinus (consul, 325) inside the basilica 'with corpse in situ'. See C. Machado, 'Roman aristocrats and the Christianisation of Rome' in P. Brown, and R. Lizzi Testa (eds.), *Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire: The Breaking of a Dialogue (IVth-VIth Century A.D.)*, Proceedings of the International Conference at the Monastery of Bose (October 2008) (Zurich, 2011), p. 502.

[7] Machado, 'Roman aristocrats and the Christianisation of Rome', pp. 504. In contrast, D. Kinney, 'Expanding the Christian Footprint', in I. Foletti and M. Gianandrea (eds.), *The Fifth Century in Rome: Art, Liturgy Patronage*, Studia Artium Mediaevalium Brunensia, no. 4 (Rome, 2017), p. 81, considers the church a *parochia*, and the first clearly identifiable example of a papal basilica intended to provide for the living, rather than the dead, in the *suburbium*. Either interpretation is possible but I prefer Machado's assessment of it as a dynastic chapel.

[8] Markus *Gregory the Great and his World*, pp. 10 and 71; J. Richards, *Consul of God: The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London, 1980), pp. 31-36 and 70-72.

[9] John Lydus, *On Powers*, I.15. p. 29; Kelly, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire*, p. 51.

[10] I also exclude from the analysis tax exemptions which could be considered a form of patronage. There is almost no evidence for the period after 476 on this subject. A fragment of a letter of Gelasius I to the Ostrogoth Theoderic, suggesting that he honour the laws of Roman emperors because of the reverence

Sources

We must reconstruct patronage at Rome by gleaning from a variety of sources: textual, archaeological, artistic and epigraphic. The *Liber Pontificalis* is the major textual source but, as Robert Coates-Stephens and others have shown, it has a clear papal bias: it omits many non-papal buildings and other forms of patronage.[11] However, if considered as a history of the Roman Church, rather than as a history of Rome, that bias may not be as great as some think. An additional textual source is the subscription lists of the Roman synods of 499 and 595, which may provide the only information that we have for a particular church. Other sources of considerable importance include: the five-volume *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae*;[12] G.B. De Rossi's *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Roma* and the ten-volume new series with the same title edited by A. Silvagni and others and E. Diehl's *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*.[13] Additionally, I look at a few fourth- and early fifth-century elite Roman sarcophagi and several fifth- and sixth-century church mosaics. Overall, the picture on patronage remains incomplete although it is being added to as further archaeological findings become public.

Historiography

The overarching concern of much of the scholarship on patronage of the Roman Church has been to explain the emergence of the papacy as an institution, and for this, church construction has attracted the most interest. Historians and archaeologists have mainly taken one or more of three approaches. First, a few have sought to explain the rise of the bishop of Rome to a position of dominance in the city through church building. Second, other scholars, taking an isomorphic approach in linking papal buildings with imperial and senatorial constructions, argue that constructing churches was a component of papal authority. Third, another group of historians has focused on a particular class of patron, mainly aristocrats but more recently clergy, either on its own and/or on how its members interacted with other classes. The approaches are not mutually exclusive. Most of the scholarship has focused on the period before 476.

---

due to the apostle Peter, might, at a considerable stretch, suggest that tax exemptions were under threat but little or nothing can be made of this subject. *Fragment 12,* in *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, pp. 489-90, quoted in Neil and Allen, *The Letters of Gelasius I*, pp. 23-24.

[11] I discuss below R. Coates-Stephens, 'Byzantine Building Patronage in Post-Reconquest Rome' in M. Ghilardi et al.(eds). *Les Cités de l'Italie tardo-antique* (*IVe-VIe siècle*): *Institutions, Économie. Culture et Religion* (Rome, 2006), pp. 149-66.

[12] R. Krautheimer et al., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae, The Early Christian Basilicas of Rome (IV to IX Centuries)*, Monumenti di antichità cristiana Series 2, no. 2, 5 vols. (Rome, 1937-77).

[13] G.B. De Rossi (ed.), *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*, Vols. I-II.1 (1857-88); A. Silvagni, A Ferrua, and D. Mazzoleni (eds.), *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*: *nova series*, 10 vols. (Rome, 1922-85); E. Diehl (ed.), *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1925-31).

A strand in the historiography, now accepted as teleological, sought to explain the rise of the Church of Rome in the city by reference to dominant papal church building. Richard Krautheimer argued that the dominance started at the beginning of the fourth century, that the papacy had a programme, and that by the second third of the fifth century church building in Rome had become the exclusive responsibility of the papacy.[14] While not going as far, Hugo Brandenburg similarly considers that there was a strategy to establish a Christian presence in key locations to raise the Church's profile.[15] Against these views, John Curran observes that fourth-century bishops of Rome were frequent builders, but they could not mobilise resources on an imperial scale, and there was no comprehensive programme to cover Rome with churches.[16] Manuela Gianandrea suggests that by the middle of the fifth century popes had gone beyond their basic concerns of territorial expansion and organisation for the care of souls, and were triumphantly affirming themselves through monumental and luxurious buildings. She also notes that from the pontificate of Sixtus III (432-40) onwards, the focal point of papal evergetism was the 'great sanctuaries' (St Peter's, St Paul's, St Laurence's and the Basilica Constantiniana) and that, contra Krautheimer, the pope was not the only patron: there was widespread concurrent commissioning of buildings by emperors, aristocrats and rich laymen.[17]

Other historians argue that church construction was an expression of papal authority as, in an isomorphic fashion, it echoed imperial public building in Rome. The construction of public monuments in Rome was invariably an expression of imperial authority or senatorial prestige. From the middle of the Augustus's reign public spaces were the preserve of the imperial family and their most loyal supporters. Curran argues that Constantine's constructions of Christian churches fell within the framework of existing public architecture: they were intended to reflect 'size, grandeur and richness', to promote Constantine, to assert his piety and to declare his triumphant leadership.[18] Similarly, Nicola Camerlenghi considers that Theodosius I, in constructing St Paul's on a scale to match St Peter's, asserted both his equality with Constantine and the arrival of a new dynasty.[19] This strong association between emperors' political aims and major public construction has led to similar connections being made between episcopal constructions and popes' objectives and aspirations. Caroline Goodson argues that churches founded and endowed by emperors and popes were 'new forms of old monuments'

---

[14] Krautheimer, *Rome: Profile of a City* (Princeton, 1980/2000), Chapter 2, especially pp. 34 and 52.
[15] H. Brandenburg, *Ancient Churches of Rome: From the Fourth to the Seventh Centuries. The Dawn of Christian Architecture in the West.* Bilbiothèque de l'Antiquité Tardive, no. 8 (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 134, 153 and 165-66.
[16] J. Curran, *Pagan City and Roman Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 117 and 156.
[17] M. Gianandrea, 'The Artistic Patronage of the Popes in Fifth-Century Rome' in Foletti and Gianandrea (eds.), *The Fifth Century in Rome*, pp. 183-202 and 211-13.
[18] Curran, *Pagan City and Roman Capital*, pp. 112-14.
[19] N. Camerlenghi, *St Paul's Outside the Walls: A Roman Basilica, from Antiquity to the Modern Era* (Cambridge, 2018), p. 44. Camerlenghi observes that although the church is known as the 'Basilica of the Three Emperors', Theodosius was the dominant patron.

and, for instance, the church of SS. Cosmae et Damiani with its apse mosaic was 'a new expression of civic munificence'.[20] Ward-Perkins suggests that the *Liber Pontificalis* shows that fine buildings as displays of piety and splendour were expected of popes as much as they were of the secular ruler.[21] Herman Geertman considers that the text, with its detail of papal constructions, consciously outlined an image of the bishops of Rome as benefactors equal to worthy emperors.[22]

Since the 1970s there has been a major focus on the role of aristocrats as patrons with some historians addressing their connections with *tituli*, and others exploring how Christianisation resulted in patronage. Charles Pietri was the first to emphasise the role of the aristocracy; he argued that they founded and endowed *tituli*, mostly in the fourth century if not earlier.[23] Peter Llewellyn also considered the *tituli* to be aristocratic foundations and saw an inherent tension between the titular clergy, whose independence was underwritten by their endowments, and their bishop.[24] The Manchester University-based Religion, Dynasty and Patronage Project (RDPP), which sought to update Pietri and Llewellyn's work, was predicated on the notion that the role of lay elites in Christian institutions in Rome has been underappreciated due to a loss of non-papal archives.[25] There is a broad, but not complete, consensus that due to aristocratic funding *tituli* remained at least semi-independent into the sixth century, as evidenced by titular priests' behaviour in the Laurentian schism (498-506/7).[26] Kate Cooper, a RDPP member, envisages a Roman Church comprised of competing titular-based factions in which clergy were led by aristocrats.[27]

Other historians have considered aristocratic patronage as a function of the class's 'almost genetically wired' propensity to civic evergetism and their Christianisation, but have not necessarily focused exclusively on Rome.[28] Ward-Perkins observes that for most propertied classes in Northern Italy in Late Antiquity, the construction of church buildings was a wholly new venture: it satisfied traditional secular needs and new religious ones, the benefit of their or

[20] Goodson, 'Roman Archaeology in Medieval Rome', pp. 23–45.
[21] Ward-Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, p. 77.
[22] Geertman, H., 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis* romano', pp. 37-107, particularly p. 43.
[23] Pietri, Roma christiana, p. 573 and 'Evergétisme et richesses ecclésiastiques dans l'Italie du IVe à la fin du Ve siècle: l'exemple romain', *Ktema* 3 (1978), pp. 317-37, both quoted by P. Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550 AD* (Princeton, 2012), p. 248 and n. 23. Also, Pietri, 'Donateurs et pieux établissements d'après le légendier roman (Ve-VIIe s.) in *Hagiographie, cultures, sociétes. IVe-XIIe siècles,* Actes du colloque organise à Nanterre et à Paris (2-5 Mai 1979), (Paris, 1981), pp. 435-53.
[24] Llewellyn, 'The Roman Church during the Laurentian Schism', pp 417-27, especially 425-27.
[25] Cooper and Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage*, pp. 3-7. In their Introduction, Cooper and Hillner frequently use the term 'lay' rather than 'aristocratic' but, I suggest, it is clear in almost all cases that they mean 'aristocratic'.
[26] Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, p. 489.
[27] Cooper and Hillner, *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage*, p. 12.
[28] Brown's felicitous expression, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, p. 68.

their relatives' souls or gaining the goodwill of God and the saints.[29] Peter Brown has also stressed the novelty of the motivation to give to the Church: replacing civic evergetism with almsgiving required an 'imaginative revolution' with donors wishing to 'build up treasure in heaven' for themselves. He considers the core aristocracy converted in the 340s/350s, argues that the truly rich began to enter the church after 370, and opines that the late fourth century/early fifth century was the time when the 'footprint of real wealth could now be seen in Christian churches all over the city'.[30] He points to the difficulty in identifying the rich patrons but suggests that they were 'new men' who operated at a level below the likes of the consul and four-time prefect Petronius Probus, and the consul and urban prefect Aurelius Symmachus, who spent 2,000 pounds of gold on celebratory games for his son's praetorship.[31] Michele Salzman sees much of the aristocracy remaining pagan into the 380s/390s.[32] She points to a division between the old senatorial families who were slower to convert and newly advanced aristocrats.[33] She argues that aristocrats were inclined to follow the example of emperors as patrons of the Church, not as a top-down exercise, but because emperors acted in conventionally aristocratic ways.[34] Brown's, and to a lesser extent Salzman's, identification of new aristocrats as patrons is supported by findings of Gregory Kalas and Carlos Machado, who show in regard to two examples in Rome how aspirant or newly-ennobled aristocrats used constructions, in one case a basilica, in the other a mausoleum attached to the high-profile *Basilica Apostolorum*, to consolidate their positions among the elite.[35]

In recent years there has been an increased interest in clerical patronage of the Roman Church. Julia Hillner follows Federico Guidobaldi in offering a more positive assessment of the clergy's contribution in founding and maintaining titular churches.[36] She observes that we know much more about clerics than about the aristocrats involved in the *tituli*, and suggests many of them were from wealthy urban classes and may have engaged in constructions, even when aristocrats were the original founders. She rejects the likelihood of aristocratic endowments. She posits that from a financial perspective, clerical patronage of *tituli* was possible.[37] One question

[29] Ward-Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, p. 71.
[30] Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, p. 247.
[31] Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, p. 115.
[32] M.R. Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy: Social and Religious Change in the Western Roman Empire* (Cambridge MA, 2002), p. 79.
[33] Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy,* 179.
[34] Salzman, *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy*, 198.
[35] G. Kalas, 'Architecture and Elite Identity in Late Antique Rome: Appropriating the Past at Sant'Andrea Catabarbara', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 81 (2013), pp. 279-302; Machado, 'Roman aristocrats and the Christianisation of Rome', pp. 517-528.
[36] F. Guidobaldi, ''La Fondazione delle basiliche titulori di Roma nel iv e v secolo. Assenze e presenze nel *Liber Pontificalis'* in Papers of the Netherlands Institute in Rome (Antiquity), 60(1) (2003), quoted by J. Hillner, 'Clerics, property and patronage: the case of the Roman titular churches', *Antiquité Tardive*, 14(1) (2006), pp. 60.
[37] Hillner, 'Clerics, property and patronage', pp. 59-68; Hillner, 'Families, patronage and the titular churches of Rome' in Cooper and Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage*, pp. 245-48.

currently receiving more attention is the extent to which particular churches may have been family concerns, which may lead to some re-assessment of current views. Salzman points out that in fifth-century Rome sons were advanced into positions in *tituli,* and that three of the twelve popes in that century had fathers who were titular priests, and the fathers of two others held the key position of deacon.[38] However, to date no work, of which I am aware, attempts to explain how the position of the Roman clergy might have changed as the Church was transformed in the sixth century.

My analysis and argument differ in certain important respects from this scholarship. I agree with Gianandrea's identification of popes' focus on major basilicas starting with Sixtus III, but rather than seeing this as part of a triumphal affirmation the papal presence in the city, I argue that it represented a strategic focus on the Church's major assets for liturgical and pastoral purposes. I accept that there were isomorphic components to the popes' authority in that they constructed churches and in so doing earned prestige, but I consider this should not be pushed too far. As I show, the Roman Church was an ecclesiastical institution with its own concerns and institutional agendas. My focus on the Church as the institution *in* Rome results in conclusions which are different to those of historians who look at the Roman Church-aristocracy relationship more broadly. I point to major changes in the clergy's position, significantly affecting their role as patrons after 476, a development which, to date, has been largely unaddressed.

Argument and Methodology

Methodologically, I analyse and compare patterns of patronage before and after 476 by reference to class of patron and category of patronage. I examine the earlier period in order to establish a base with which to consider changes after 476 and to test the hypothesis that the cessation of the line of western emperors was a significant factor in the development and the transformation of the Roman Church as an institution. I focus on patronage of the Church as defined above rather than a looser understanding of the Roman Church. I argue that the demise of western emperors in 476 had a significant impact on patronage of the Church and transformed the institution. Secular rulers ceased to be major patrons of the Church. Aristocrats continued on the trajectory established before 476 of seeing to their own interests; they ceased to be significant patrons sometime before their exodus from Rome at the start of the Gothic Wars. Clergy ceased to be observable as patrons as a new financial arrangement gave them a share in success and profits of the Church and, for some, clerical office became an investment. Popes emerged as the sole main patrons and strategically focused their patronage on the three

[38] M.R Salzman, presentation on 'Presbyters in the *Tituli* in 5th-Century Rome: Patrons and Clients', Leeds International Medieval Congress, 2-5 July 2018.

major basilicas, cemeterial basilicas and cemeteries, possibly as a reflection of reduced resources. They also developed a new form of patronage, the introduction of saint-cults.

Going forward, I divide the chapter into two sections, showing the patronage of the Roman Church before and after 476. In Section 1, I analyse the incidence of different forms of patronage for the period 312-476 before considering the respective contributions of emperors, aristocrats, popes and clergy. In Section 2, I first show that subsequent secular rulers (Herulian and Ostrogothic kings and eastern emperors) did not become serious patrons and that aristocrats as a class ceased to be major patrons. I explain the transformation of the clergy's relationship with the Church which resulted in them ceasing to be significant patrons. I then consider the position of popes as patrons and show how new saint-cults became a new form of patronage.

Section 1: Patronage of the Roman Church 312-476

In this section, I analyse patterns of patronage from the conversion of Constantine (312) to the deposition of Romulus Augustulus (476). I focus on the three main forms of patronage for which information is available (constructions; decoration, additions, alterations and repairs; and liturgical furnishings and vessels) before consolidating the results to assess the contribution of each class of patron. The problems with the data are considerable. Nevertheless, certain trends are observable. Western emperors remained patrons throughout the period. The position of aristocrats is difficult to determine: they enter the record as patrons at the point that Brown and Salzman suggest, but their contribution may not have resulted in many churches and where it did, it is appropriate to consider how the aristocrats processed developments; those whom historians identify as the more likely patrons appear to have made their patronage work to their political and social advantage. It is difficult to be certain about popes' contributions as patrons but in the last third of the period there was a discernible trend of their directing their patronage in ways that supported their liturgical and pastoral responsibilities. The clergy were notable players but at times it is difficult to determine whether they were patrons or project managers of others' patronage.

Tables

The principal data is shown in three Tables. Each table starts with the reign of Constantine. Clearly there were patrons before him but he transformed the landscape of Christian evergetism and I consider the year 312 to be an appropriate starting point. In constructing the tables, I have had to make decisions on whether works should count as a new basilica (and so be placed in

Table 4.1) or fall to be treated as alterations (Table 4.2); where the work has been sufficiently substantial so as to appear to be a new entity, I have treated it as a new construction.[39] I divide the period into three sub-periods: from the conversion of Constantine to the end of Liberius's pontificate (312-66), from the pontificate of Damasus to that of Celestine (366-432) and from Pope Sixtus III to the deposition of Romulus Augustulus (432-76). As Damasus and Sixtus were significant in the development of the papacy, the former for bringing a new approach to papal authority and arguably for encouraging new patrons, the latter for inaugurating a new building programme, their reigns conveniently introduce the second and third sub-periods.

The tables need to be read with some caution. The *Liber Pontificalis* is very important as a source but it probably under-reports non-papal patronage. It can be difficult to determine who was the main patron in circumstances where there may have been more than one, either sequentially or contemporaneously, or where roles of individuals are unclear. A *domus ecclesiae* may have started as an aristocratic donation and then have been converted into a substantial *titulus* by its clergy or the pope. F.W. Deichmann notes in regard to Ravenna that Bishop Ecclesius's role was limited to authorising the construction of San Vitale at Ravenna, yet he was viewed as a donor.[40] The same convention may have been at play in Rome. It remains unclear whether Pope Leo I or the empress Galla Placidia repaired St Paul's after a fire. The *Liber* states that Leo renewed the building.[41] However, an inscription reports: 'the pious soul of Placidia rejoices that through the care of Pope Leo her father's work shines through'.[42] Camerlenghi suggests that the absence of any mention of Valentinian III indicates that the empress sponsored the project financially herself.[43] In several examples it is difficult to know if clerics were donors or project managers: Vestina, a *femina illustris*, undoubtedly endowed a *titulus* in Innocent I's pontificate, but the *Liber* also attributes it to the efforts (*laborantibus*) of the priests Ursicinus and Leopardus and the deacon Livianus.[44]

I use the terms church and basilica interchangeably; in this I follow the authors of the *Liber Pontificalis* who sometimes used 'basilica' to describe those churches in Rome which were not *tituli* but equally used it for *tituli*.[45] Between the Synods of Rome in 499 and 595 the names of a number of *tituli* changed from those of probable secular patrons to those of saints. In the tables,

[39] For Tables 4.1 and 4.2 see the Appendix (Tables), pp. 183-91 and 192-98.
[40] F.W. Deichmann, *Ravenna, Hauptstadt in der spätantiken Abendlandes* (Wiesbaden, 1976), pp. 7-33, quoted by D. Deliyannis, *Ravenna in late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 225.
[41] *LP* 47.6: 'Hic … et beati Pauli post ignem divinum renovavit';'
[42] *ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4784: 'Placidiae pia mens operis decus omne paterni / Gaudet Pontificis Studio splendere Leonis'.
[43] Camerlenghi, *St Paul's Outside the Walls*, p.93.
[44] *LP*, 42.3: '[Innocentius] dedicavit basilicam sanctorum Gervasi et Protasi ex devotione cuiusdam inlustris feminae Vestinae, laborantibus presbiteris Ursicino et Leopardo et diacono Liviano'.
[45] Glossary, *The Book of the Pontiffs*, pp. 108-09.

I start with the original name and show the new name in brackets. Churches may appear twice or more (with numbers in brackets) if they were re-built or reconstructed.

Church Constructions 312-476

For the period before 312, Table 4.1 records eleven house-churches or *domus ecclesiae*, probably established by aristocrats, which later became *tituli*.[46] For the first sub-period (312-66), it is possible to identify nine buildings that Constantine and his family constructed or founded: the Basilica Constantiniana, St Peter's, the first church of St Paul and some six circiform funerary basilicas.[47] The *Liber Pontificalis* attributes the foundation of three *tituli* to popes, as well as the basilica Julii, the basilica Liberii, and the church S. Valentini in a cemetery on the Via Flamina. There is no extant evidence of aristocratic foundations. The second sub-period (366-432) was rich in foundations. The emperors Theodosius I, Valentinian II and Honorius rebuilt St Paul's on a scale to match St Peter's. Twelve *tituli* were founded. With considerably varying degrees of certainty, I follow others in attributing four to popes, two to aristocrats, two to clergy and one, the *titulus* Clementis, to 'the collective commission of a Christian community'.[48] In addition, Pope Boniface I built an oratory in the cemetery of St Felicity on the Via Salaria Nova.[49]

In the third sub-period (432-76), imperial patronage comprised the empress Eudoxia's involvement in the rebuilding of the *titulus* S. Petri in vinculis and one or more emperors' construction of S. Stephani in celio monte (dedicated 468-83). Popes Sixtus III (432-40) and Hilarus (461-68) were significant patrons. Sixtus finished and dedicated S. Mariae, the only basilica to approach imperial ecclesiastical constructions in size and decoration in the fourth and fifth centuries; he is also credited with building a basilical monastery, In catacumbas, near S. Sebastiani on the Via Appia, and a church dedicated to St Laurence.[50] Hilarus engaged in significant building programmes at the Lateran and St Laurence's: at the former he constructed four oratories; at the latter a basilical monastery, a *praetorium* (residence), two libraries and two baths.[51] Leo I (440-61) founded a church in honour of a predecessor, Pope Cornelius, near the cemetery of Callistus.[52] Unknown patrons built or rebuilt five other *tituli*. Aside from these, aristocrats founded three churches, none of which became *tituli*: Demetrias's church S. Stephani on the Via Lata (between 441 and 460), the Catholic Gothic general Valila's

[46] For the earliest *tituli* see J.F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy* (Rome, 1987), p. 108.
[47] M. Hellström, 'On the Form and Function of Constantine's Circiform Funerary Basilicas in Rome' in M.R. Salzman, M. Sághy and R. Lizzi Testa (eds.) *Pagans and Christians in Late Antique Rome: Conflict, Competition and Coexistence in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge, 2016), pp. 291-313.
[48] See Kinney, 'Expanding the Christian Footprint', p.70, on the *titulus* S. Clementis.
[49] *LP* 44.6.
[50] *LP* 46.3, 6-7.
[51] *LP* 48.2-6 and 48.12.
[52] *LP* 47.6

transformation of the secular aula of Junius Bassus (470-79), and the *magister militum* Ricimer's construction of an Arian church on the Viminal hill (462-70).

Decoration, Alterations and Repairs 312-476

This second category of patronage, shown in Table 4.2, is potentially the most interesting but also the most frustrating. If the pattern described by Ward-Perkins for Northern Italy had been replicated in Rome, we might expect to identify considerable aristocratic patronage in the form of mosaics and floors and their assumption of responsibility for repairs, but the information is very slight.[53] In the first sub-period, the *Liber* and the apocryphal *Gesta Liberii* state that Pope Liberius decorated the tomb of St Agnes with marble panels and that 'in his time an apse was constructed in the fifth region'.[54] For the second sub-period, we are dependent on inscriptions. The presbyters Leopardus, Illicius and Maximus, who appear to have been responsible for construction of the *titulus* Pudentis (also known as S. Pudentianae), were additionally responsible for its decoration.[55] A similar attribution can probably be made for S. Sabinae which Peter of Illyria constructed and richly decorated.[56] We have no insight into who may have decorated the other eight *tituli*. Leopardus also contributed a mosaic or fresco at St Laurence's, while Illicius contributed an unspecified building at the catacomb of Hippolytus.[57] Other presbyters, Proclinus and Ursus, constructed a chancel screen at S. Sebastiani.[58] Only one inscription reveals any aristocratic patronage between 366 and 432: the Urban Prefect Longinianus's gift of a baptistry, possibly at S. Anastasiae.[59] However, this is a credible form of patronage and we should not rule out that it might have been repeated elsewhere. For the third sub-period, we are mainly dependent on the *Liber*, although a few extant inscriptions reveal aristocratic donations. Most of the extant information refers to work carried out at the major basilicas of St Peter's and St Paul's.

Donations of Liturgical Furnishings and Vessels 312-476

The third category, shown in Table 3, is of most interest for the churches for which no information is available.[60] Here we are almost entire dependent on the *Liber*. I suggest that it is a reasonable working assumption that all, or almost all, basilicas would have had furnishings and vessels, and probably from their foundations. A gap analysis allows for speculation on

[53] Ward-Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, p. 53.
[54] *LP* 37.7; *Gesta Liberii*, *PL* 8, 1393: 'in eius tempore fabricata est absis in urbe Roma in regione quinta.' The *Gesta* was apocrypha produced in the Laurentian schism (498-506/7).
[55] De Rossi, *Musaici et saggi dei pavimenti delle chiese di Roma anteriori al secolo XV* (Rome, 1899), (pages in the volume are not numbered).
[56] *LP* 46.8.
[57] *CBCR*, III, p 280.
[58] *ILCV*, I, no. 1776.
[59] *ICUR*, II.1, p. 24, no. 19; *CBCR*, I, pp. 43-48, 62-63; Brandenburg, *Ancient Churches of Rome*, pp. 134-36.
[60] For Table 4.3 see the Appendix (Tables), pp. 199-203.

possible donors. For the first sub-period the *Liber* provides very detailed information of Constantine's gifts to the basilica at the Lateran, St Peter's, St Paul's, and the Basilica in palatio sessoriano, as well as to the basilicas S. Agnae, St Laurence's and SS. Marcellini et Petri.[61] It only provides similar information for two of the six probable papal foundations, one of which, the *titulus* Equitii, also received vessels and furnishings from Constantine.[62] For the second sub-period, it provides information for only two of the twelve *tituli* (those founded by Pope Damasus and the illustrious lady Vestina). Otherwise, the authors noted Pope Boniface I's gifts to the oratory he constructed in the cemetery of St Felicity, and Pope Celestine's to St Peter's, St Paul's and the basilica Julii.[63] For the third sub-period, the editors only provide details of papal donations; they detail Sixtus III's donations to S. Mariae, and his and Leo's and Hilarus's gifts to the major basilicas (St Peter's, St Paul's and St Laurence's) and the latter two popes' across-the-board gifts to the *tituli* (Leo's replacement of silver services taken by the Vandals, Hilarus's provision of vessels for their role as liturgical stations).[64]

Emperors as Patrons

Looking at all three tables together, but focusing on separate classes of patrons, it is clear that emperors were patrons throughout the period. The most significant imperial patronage, in terms of magnitude and probable cost, is that of Constantine and his sons in the first sub-period: the construction of St Peter's, the Basilica Constantiniana, the basilica in palatio sessoriano, the churches S. Agnae, SS Marcellini et Petri, other churches dedicated to St Paul and St Laurence as well as several other circiform basilicas. The *Liber* presents these foundations as a model of patronage: constructions accompanied by endowments and the provision of liturgical furnishings.[65] Subsequent sub-periods saw, as major constructions, St Paul's and S. Stephani in celio monte. These constructions, the basilica in palatio sessoriano and S. Stephani in celio monte excepted, were outside the city walls. The construction of S. Stephani shows that an imperial interest in combining patronage and the making of political statements continued up to the end of the period.[66] Lesser imperial patronage included Valentinian III's presentation of a gold image at St Peter's, his construction of the *confessio* at St Paul's and a 1,610lb *fastigium* at the Basilica Constantiniana, the empress Eudoxia's involvement in S.Petri in vinculis, and Galla Placidia's contribution to repairs at St Paul's.[67] While imperial patronage appears to have

[61] *LP* 34.
[62] *LP* 34.33.
[63] *LP* 44.6, 45.2.
[64] *LP* 46.6-7, 47.6, 48.11.
[65] *LP* 34 (Life of Silvester).
[66] Gianandrea, 'The Artistic Patronage of Popes in the Fifth Century', p. 252, argues that it was initiated by Valentinian III and the empress Eudoxia and carried forward by later emperors. She suggests that it conveyed concern for the monumental appearance of the city and competed with the papacy in the ambitions of its artistic patronage.
[67] *LP* 46.4-5; *ICUR,* II.1, p.110, no. 66 (Eudoxia); *ICUR-NS,* II, no. 4784 (Galla Placidia).

tapered down towards the end, the initial contribution was very significant, and a continuation at the earlier rate would almost certainly have been unsustainable.

Aristocratic Patrons

The Tables seem to support Brown and Salzman's judgements as to the timing at which the new wave of aristocratic patrons entered the field, that is the second sub-period, but not the level of patronage that they imply. However, I suggest that we need to recognise that the aristocracy's relationship with the Roman Church may have been more nuanced than acknowledged to date. On a subject in which the evidence is very limited and it is difficult not to bring to bear insights from a wider pool of cases, I suggest that aristocrats' behaviour regarding burials at major basilicas and a clutch of church constructions in Rome in the third sub-period may provide a better perspective on aristocratic patronage in the period leading up to 476.

Firm evidence of aristocratic patronage in the period is limited. The Tables reflect none in the first sub-period. The critical second sub-period is notable for the construction of the twelve *tituli* but only two can firmly be attributed to aristocrats (Vestina and Pammachius).[68] The information in Tables 2 and 3 is very limited: we only know of one example in each: the urban prefect Longinianus's gift of a baptistry and Vestina's donation of liturgical vessels. The third sub-period is notable for constructions by Demetrias, the *magister militum* Ricimer, the Catholic Goth general Valila and probable unknown aristocrats at S. Bibianae and S. Stephani (at St Laurence's) (Table 4.1), as well as a mosaic contributed by the prefect Marinianus and his wife at St Peter's and the decoration of an apse by 'Severus and Cassia' at S. Anastasiae (both Table 4.2).[69] Nothing is known of Severus and Cassia, but they may have been spouses and aristocratic status is certainly possible.[70] Limited as this evidence is, it almost certainly does not reflect the full range of patronage and what we are aware of may not be as straightforward as it appears.

Sarcophagi found at major basilicas may reflect how senatorial aristocrats sought to engage as patrons but not in a way that resulted in church construction. J.M. Huskinson analysed some thirty sarcophagi, eight of which were found at St Peter's or the Vatican complex, four at St Paul's and seven at or around S. Sebastiani.[71] He attributes most of them to the years c.360-

[68] *LP* 42.3-5 (Vestina); *ICUR*, II.1, p. 150 (Pammachius).
[69] *ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4102 (Marinianus); *ICUR*, II.1, p. 24, no. 25 (Severus and Cassia).
[70] The nature of Severus and Cassia's votive gift is not clear but reference in the inscription to '*in absida*' and '*antistes Damasus picturae ornorat honore*' has led scholars to conclude that it was the decoration of the apse which replaced early work by Damasus. See *ICUR*, II.1 p.24, no. 25; Gianandrea, 'The Artistic patronage of the Popes in Fifth-Century Rome', pp. 205-06.
[71] J.M. Huskinson, *Concordia Apostolorum, Christian Propaganda at Rome in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries: A Study in Early Christian Iconography and Iconology*, BAR International Series no. 148 (Oxford, 1982), pp. 13-31. Camerlenghi, *St Paul's Outside the Walls*, pp. 36-37, has updated the

c.410.[72] Most of the occupants are unknown but two were high-profile. Junius Bassus, who died in office as urban prefect in 359 and was probably accorded a public funeral, was buried under the *confessio* at St Peter's.[73] Petronius Probus, who died in 395, received an ostentatious burial in the large Anician mausoleum that abutted the apse of St Peter's.[74] The mausoleum had five statues that recorded his virtues and accomplishments, as well as those of his wife and children. His burial chamber had a large *mensa* for feeding the poor on his anniversary.[75] A letter of Paulinus of Nola reveals that anniversaries were occasions of considerable expenditure and probable patronage. Writing to the senator Pammachius, patron of the *titulus* SS. Iohannis et Pauli, he described a significant feast in the courtyard of St Peter's for the Christian poor on the anniversary of the senator's wife's death.[76] There is no evidence that these occasions resulted in a recognisably material form of patronage but it would be surprising if the Church did not benefit significantly from aristocrats' burials and anniversary commemorations. The location of burial and celebration at these sites shows aristocrats adapting their practice in a Christian milieu. They may have provided an opportunity for aristocrats to celebrate their families' achievements, as is apparent in the case of Petronius Probus, in ways that rare public funerals denied them.[77] They may also have intended to signal to emperors that they engaged in the project of Christianisation. I consider that these burials and celebrations show that aristocrats took control of the new situation to service their own needs, including demonstrating commitment to the new imperial order. I suggest that this approach is clearer in the way a number of aristocrats approached church construction.

When aristocrats constructed churches, they did so in many cases for their own benefit and not as patrons of the Roman Church. Two clear examples of patronage are the aristocrat Vestina's sponsorship of the *titulus* S. Vitalis and the senator Pammachius's foundation of SS. Iohannis et Pauli. Much less clear are three cases in the third sub-period: Demetrias's S. Stephani in Via Lata, S. Bibianae and Valila's S. Andreae. I do not consider Demetrias's foundation was part of the Roman Church in the period; inter alia it was a dynastic funerary chapel.[78] The position of S. Bibianae is more uncertain. The *Liber* notes it as a basilica *ad sanctos*.[79] It was recorded as a

information for St Paul's: four ornate sarcophagi, dated to the mid-fourth century and in the original Constantinian basilica, were transferred into the Theodosian one.

[72] Huskinson, *Concordia Apostolorum*, pp. 18-24 and 26.

[73] Alan Cameron, 'The Funeral of Junius Bassus' in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 139 (2002), pp. 288-92.

[74] *ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4219; Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, p. 286.

[75] Machado, 'Roman aristocrats and the Christianisation of Rome', pp. 510-12.

[76] Letter 13(11), P.G. Walsh (ed.), *The Letters of Paulinus of Nola*, Ancient Christian Writers, no. 35, Vol. 1 (New York, 1966), pp.127-28; Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, pp. 233-34.

[77] Cameron, 'The Funeral of Junius Bassus', p. 291, notes that the major role of the elite in the obsequies of public funerals must have diminished the ability of the great families to exploit the occasions for their own glorification.

[78] I discuss this above; see pp. 114-115.

[79] *LP* 49.1.

titulus in synodical subscriptions in 595 but not in 499. Brandenburg argues that Pope Simplicius, who dedicated it, may have been the founder on the basis of a possible drawing of its apse mosaic.[80] Gianandrea, following Fiocchi Nicolai, argues that the original basilica was inserted into a patrician's house and as Bibiana was buried within the walls it may well have been 'a domestic memorial together with a funerary space'.[81] We do not know the basis on which it was given to the pope but I suggest that it is possible that it continued its funerary function for the donor family until sometime before 595 when it became part of the Roman Church as a *titulus*. A clearer example of aristocrats constructing churches for their own purposes is Valila's conversion of the *aula* of Junius Bassus.

The facts surrounding the church which Valila may have offered to the pope as a *titulus* convey a strong sense of an aristocrat pursuing his own agenda in a way that questions whether it could be considered patronage of the Roman Church. The Gothic Catholic general converted the hall of the former residence of Junius Bassus, a praetorian prefect (318-31) and consul (331), into the church of S. Andreae on the Esquiline in Rome. He left unaltered the hall and existing pagan imagery but inserted an altar and an apse mosaic. For this Romanised Goth the conversion of the hall into a church was a means of negotiating his elite identity.[82] An extant inscription implies that he transferred the legitimate title to the property to Pope Simplicius: 'This church, as your [i.e. Simplicius's] heir, takes possession of your lawful title (*titulus iustus*)'.[83] The meaning is not obvious, but Gregor Kalas suggests that Valila donated the property in a process resembling that for *tituli* in Rome. However, it does not appear among *tituli* listed in the records of the synods of Rome in 499 and 595. We cannot be sure why it was not accepted as a *titulus*, but two reasons suggest themselves. First, given how the building was converted and Valila's agenda, it was unlikely to have functioned as a community church. Second, the gift may have been hedged with conditions which the pope may have considered too constraining to accept. Valila also donated a church in Tivoli for which the document evidencing the gift, the *Charta Cornutiana*, has survived in a medieval copy. Valila insisted on use of the property in his lifetime and took measures to ensure that his memory as the donor would survive, thus guaranteeing his salvation. He provided for lighting, personnel and maintenance, but claimed for himself and his descendants the right to reclaim the land if funds

[80] Brandenburg, *Ancient Churches of Rome*, p. 215.
[81] Gianandrea, 'The Artistic patronage of Popes in the Fifth-Century Rome', pp. 207-08.
[82] G. Kalas, 'Architecture and Elite Identity in Late Antique Rome: Appropriating the Past at Sant'Andrea Catabarbara', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 81 (2013), pp. 279-302. R.W. Mathisen, 'Ricimer's Church in Rome: How an Arian Barbarian Prospered in a Nicene World' in A. Cain and N. Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2009), pp. 307-25, similarly argues that the Arian Ricimer's construction and decoration of a church was part of a policy of a personal accommodation with the Italian aristocracy.
[83] *ILCV*, I, 1785; Kalas, 'Architecture and Elite Identity'. p. 293.

were diverted for purposes not specified in the charter.[84] Had the same conditions applied to S. Andreae, it is possible that the Church would not have accepted it as a functioning *titulus*.

These examples, aristocratic burials at the major basilicas and constructions or conversions, point to a more qualified engagement with the Roman Church and, I suggest, lend some support to picture that emerges from the Tables. It is possible that aristocrats were not as significant as constructors of churches as has been assumed to date, but equally possible they may have contributed to the Church's income stream. I suggest it is possible that Vestina's construction and endowment may have been rare and was mentioned in the *Liber* to encourage more of the same from the senatorial class.[85] Demetrias's church would not have been a perfect example, but her membership of the Anician family, her wealth, her correspondence with Jerome, and the fact that she was the recipient of Prosper's *De vera humilitate,* which justified wealth provided it was used on behalf of the Church, may explain why she was mentioned.[86] A case has been made that aristocrats were pre-disposed to give, but I question how quickly they would have followed the emperors' example as patrons of the Church, when their rulers had so recently abolished the pagan priesthoods in which they had invested much and which had been integral to their identity.[87]

Popes as Patrons

I consider that it is impossible to determine for the first and second two sub-periods whether the Church's footprint expanded in a haphazard or a strategic manner as Curran and Brandenburg respectively argue. Of the two, I incline towards Curran's viewpoint, although I suggest that popes' approach became much more strategic in the third sub-period as they directed their patronage at four major basilicas. Table 4.1 shows in the first sub-period only popes and emperors as patrons, a position that it is impossible to completely substantiate. The data for the second sub-period is more complex. Of the twelve *tituli* constructed, only four are attributed to popes (Damasus and Anastasius), and two of those, S. Anastasiae and Fasciolae, are speculative.[88] On the other hand, there is some reason to believe that popes were engaged in the construction of two *tituli,* S. Pudentianae and S. Sabinae that are normally attributed to clergy. The position is clearer with S. Sabinae whose foundation inscription asserts the primacy of the Roman Church and whose mosaic features the *Ecclesia ex circumcisione* and the *Ecclesia ex gentibus*. The inscription refers to Pope Celestine holding 'the highest apostolic throne and

[84] Kalas, 'Architecture and Elite Identity'. p. 291.
[85] *LP* 42.3.
[86] On Demetrias, see Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, pp. 463-64.
[87] Salzman, *The Making of the Christian Aristocracy*, discusses the significance of pagan priesthoods to aristocrats, pp. 61-65.
[88] S. Anastasiae has been attributed to Damasus on the basis of a fifth-century inscription, *ICUR*, II.1, pp. 24, no. 25 and p. 150, no. 18. Fasciolae has been attributed to him on the basis of an inscription referring to a 'lector tituli Fasciolae' (*ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4815) which is dated 377 and as such falls in his pontificate. See Curran, *Pagan City and Christian Capital*, p. 145.

shin[ing] as the foremost bishop in the whole world'.[89] The *Ecclesiae* represent the united Church, possibly representing the *Concordia Apostolorum*.[90] It has recently been plausibly suggested that Pope Celestine was involved in its planning.[91] The mosaic at S. Pudentianae also has female figures considered to represent the two *Ecclesiae,* although Walter Oakshott suggested that they may be the two sisters, SS. Pudentiana and Prassede.[92] Tables 4.2 and 4.3 reveal very little other papal patronage between 313 and 432: extant evidence only acknowledges Damasus's activities at S. Anastasiae and at St Peter's, and Innocent I's at S. Agnae, (all Table 4.2), and that Damasus, Boniface I and Celestine each provided liturgical vessels to a church (Table 4.3).[93]

In so far as it is possible to discern a pattern with such limited evidence, I consider that in the third sub-period popes directed their patronage at the major basilicas (St Peter's, St Paul's, St Laurence's and the Basilica Constantiniana) and, to a lesser extent, at the *tituli,* as they sought to address the pastoral and liturgical needs of the city's inhabitants and visitors. S. Mariae is anomalous in this scenario except in so far as it is understood as fulfilling a central role in the developing liturgical arrangements of the city: it became a major 'station' and one of the places where the *tituli's* stational vessels were kept.[94] Hilarus significantly developed the sites at the Basilica Constantiniana and at St Laurence's.[95] Most of popes' works of decoration and additions (work on *confessiones*, Sixtus III's porphyry columns and Leo's repair after lightning) were undertaken at the four basilicas.[96] Popes from Celestine to Simplicius consistently provided liturgical vessels, most of which were given to the major basilicas.[97] This emphasis was reinforced by Simplicius's arrangement for priests from different regions to take weekly turns to administer baptism and penance at St Peter's, St Paul's and St Laurence's.[98] Popes' patronage also evinced a concern for liturgical services at the *tituli*. Leo melted down 6 water-jars at the major basilicas to replace silver vessels taken by the Vandals from the *tituli*.[99] Hilarus's provision of 1 gold *scyphus*, 25 silver *scyphi* 'for the *tituli*', 25 *amae* and 50 silver service chalices is the first textual evidence of stational liturgy in the city.[100]

---

[89] *ICLV,* I, 1778a: 'Culmen apostolicum cum Caelestinus haberet, primus in toto fulgeret eiscopus orbe'.
[90] I suggest this latter point on the basis that Peter was the apostle of the Jews, Paul of the Gentiles and the presentation of the apostles in harmony was prevalent at this time.
[91] Gianandrea, 'The Artistic Patronage of popes in Fifth-Century Rome', pp. 188-89.
[92] W. Oakeshott, *The Mosaics of Rome, from the Third to the Fourteenth Centuries* (London/Greenwich, 1967), p. 65.
[93] Table 4.2 (pp. 192-98): Damasus: *ICUR,* II.1, no. 24.25 and *ICUR-NS,* II, no. 4096; Innocent: *LP* 42.7. Table 4.3 (pp. 199-203): *LP* 39.4, *LP* 44.6, *LP* 45.2.
[94] *LP* 48.11.
[95] *LP* 48.2-6,9-10 and 12.
[96] *LP* 46.4-5; 47.6.
[97] Table 4.3: *LP* 45.2, 46.6-7, 48.6-10.
[98] *LP* 49.2.
[99] *LP* 47.6.
[100] *LP* 48.11.

Clerics as Patrons

Although Julia Hillner and others suggest that members of the Roman clergy may have been significant patrons, the evidence is thin and the number of identified patrons is small. Where clerics engaged in the construction of churches it is not always clear whether they were lead patrons or project managers: in some situations where they appear to be the main patrons, there are aspects in the arrangements which cast doubt on that position. In the first sub-period the only evidence of clerical patronage is the apparent grant of land by the priest Equitius to Pope Silvester for a *titulus*.[101] The evidence for the second subperiod is richer, if still limited. Of the twelve *tituli* founded or re-founded at this time, probably three can be attributed to clerics: S. Pudentianae, S. Sabinae and, with less certainly, S. Petri in vinculis. Several inscriptions indicate that the priests Ilicius, Maximus, Eutropius and Leopardus constructed S. Pudentianae, while the *Liber Pontificalis* clearly attributes S. Sabinae to Peter, a bishop from Illyricum.[102] The role of the priest Philip in founding S. Petri in vinculis is less clear. An inscription implies that it was built or funded by the empress Eudoxia in fulfilment of a promise given by her parents, Theodosius II and Eudocia.[103] Another refers to Philip's '*labor .... et cura*'. [104] A recent assessment concludes that Philip, who represented Pope Celestine at the Council of Ephesus (431), sponsored the *titulus* on his return and Eudoxia 'had something to do with it'.[105] Of these clerical patrons, Leopardus, assuming he was the same person, was also a project manager of the *illustris femina* Vestina's *titulus*, and he restored a mosaic at St Laurence's, while Ilicius constructed an unspecified building at the catacomb of Hippolytus.[106] Outside this group, we are only aware that the priests Proclinus and Ursus constructed a chancel screen at S. Sebastiani.[107]

As the need to interpret Philip's position shows, where clerics engaged in the construction of churches it is not always clear whether they were lead patrons or project managers, The priests

[101] *LP* 34.3.
[102] The inscription on apse mosaic in S. Pudentianae: 'Fundata a Leopardo et Ilicio Valent. Aug. et Eutropio Conss. Perfecta Honorio AUG IIII et Eutychiano Consulibus'; the inscription from the pontificate of Siricius: 'Salvo Siricio ecclesiae sancte et Ilicio Leopardo et Maximo (p)resb'. See De Rossi, *Musaici*, (pages not numbered).
[103] *ILCV*, I, no. 1779: 'Theodosius pater Eudocia cum coniuge votum cumque suo supplex Eudoxia nomine solvit'.
[104] *ICUR*, II.1, p.110, no 67: 'presbyteri tamen his labor et cura Philippi postquam effesi Xps vicit Effesi XPS vicit utrique popo praemia discipulis meruit'.
[105]Kinney, 'Expanding the Christian Footprint', p. 76.
[106] *LP* 42.3. According to an inscription (*ICUR*, II.1, p.155) preserved in the Sylloge Wirciburgensis, Leopardus restored the building, decorated its walls and apparently donated a mosaic or fresco, probably in the apse, showing the hand of God distributing martyrs' crowns. For Illicius at the catacomb of Hippolytus: *ICUR-NS*, VII, nos. 15762-3, quoted by Hillner, 'Clerics, Property and Patronage', p. 66.
[107] *ICLV* I, 1776: 'Temporibus Sancti Innocenti Episcopi Proclinus et Ursus Presbb Tituli Byzanti Sancto Martyri Sebastiano ex Voto Fecerunt'.

Ursicius and Leopardus and the deacon Livianus, used by Pope Innocent to give effect to the bequest of Vestina, fell in the latter category, although the language used in the *Liber* (‘*laborantibus presbiteris’*) has an echo of the inscription narrating Philip’s role in his titulus, his ‘*labor … et cura’*.[108] The attribution of S. Sabinae to Peter, ‘a priest of the city and Illyrian by birth’ appears very clear; however, the issue of possible papal involvement has already been mentioned, and current work is also suggesting that an aristocrat family may have established the original *titulus Sabinae* and consequently contributed the land as well as the name Sabina for the fifth-century church.[109] Nevertheless, as the examples infer, clerics may have been significant patrons of some of the churches.

The purpose of examining patterns of patronage between 312 and 476 has been to establish a base with which to consider changes after 476. The evidence for imperial patronage is reasonably straight-forward and uncontroversial: emperors were responsible for most of the major basilicas and even if much of their contribution was made early, it continued, with the last major basilica, S. Stephani in celio monte, constructed at the end of the period. Below this level much depends on the assessment of who sponsored the twelve *tituli* in the second sub-period, with likely candidates being aristocrats, popes and clerics. A few can be attributed to each class but there is uncertainty about the remainder. The third sub-period shows a pattern beginning to emerge, with aristocrats focusing on their own interests and popes directing their patronage at the Church’s major basilicas.

I suggest that focusing on the Church as an institution in Rome calls into question the degree to which aristocrats were its patrons. I show their patronage was less than it may have appeared to date, that we cannot assume that aristocrats re-directed their patronage to the Church, and that they processed the situation in ways that suited their interests. However, their burials and annual commemorations of the deaths of family members, may have contributed a revenue stream to the Church. Popes and clerics were significant patrons although in the case of the latter their role is not always clear. Popes built churches and *tituli* in the first two sub-periods but in the third there was a discernible strategy of focusing on the major basilicas and, to a lesser extent, on provision of liturgical vessels to the *tituli*, as they organised the Church to respond to the pastoral needs of the city. Much remains to be understood about clerical patronage, including how it interacted with that of the popes, but it cannot be ruled out that some of clerics were persons of some wealth as the *tituli* S. Pudentianae and S. Sabinae attest,

[108] *LP* 42.3. In another example, Tigrinus may have been the project manager for Demetrias’s church. However, all we know with some certainty is that he served in the hall at Leo’s command (‘praesulis hanc iussu Tigrinis presbyter aulum … excolit’), *ICUR*, I, no. 1765.
[109] M. Maskarinec, *City of Saints: Rebuilding Rome in the Early Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2018), pp. 101-06.

and in the period before 476 they may have been more significant patrons than the extant evidence allows us to capture. I now turn to the period after 476 which saw a collapse in imperial patronage, even more limited aristocratic sponsorship, almost no evidence of clerical patronage and the emergence of popes as the main patrons.

Section 2: Patronage of the Roman Church after 476

After 476, following the end of western emperors, the patronage landscape changed significantly and the Church of Rome was transformed. Popes became the main patrons as secular rulers and aristocrats ceased to be major contributors and the clergy's relationship with the Church altered. They continued the trend established in the years 432-76 of directing their patronage at the major basilicas, but they also focused on cemeterial basilicas and cemeteries. Popes introduced a new form of patronage, new saint-cults which leveraged the same type of prestige as church constructions and, in some cases, were intimately connected with them but, I argue, they were a separate phenomenon. The clergy ceased to be visible as a class of patron as the intra-Church financial arrangements changed, and payment for position or office became a feature, although it was contested and it was probably not universally adopted. In this section I address the position of secular rulers, aristocrats and clergy as patrons before demonstrating how the Roman Church was transformed as popes became the main patrons.

Secular Rulers as Patrons after 476

Imperial patronage of the Roman Church in the forms under consideration in this chapter ceased in 476. There is no information to suggest that Odoacer, the ruler of central and northern Italy was a patron of the Roman Church. I show that Arian Ostrogothic rulers, if they donated, did so in a limited way. The sources for evidence of Ostrogothic patronage are limited and difficult: the *Liber Pontificalis* only makes mention of two silver candlesticks given by Theoderic the Great to St Peter.[110] Otherwise, for his reign, we have to rely on tiles with brick-stamps, which imply that he sponsored the repair of multiple churches in Rome. However, this may be an inference too far. Eastern emperors were significant patrons neither before, nor after Justinian's reconquest. While after 554, the new Byzantine administration built churches in the city, these did not become part of the Church of Rome in the sixth century and, arguably, were set up in competition.

Theoderic, king for most of the Ostrogothic period, was a patron in the imperial mould but, I argue, his contribution to the Church was limited by his Arianism and by his particular

[110] *LP* 54.10.

tendency to subcontract patronage in Rome. Although the *Anonymous Valesianus* states that Theoderic approached the tomb of St Peter 'as if a Catholic', he is only known to have built and decorated Arian churches in northern cities, and especially in Ravenna.[111] The Temple of Romulus in the Forum Romanum, which became the basilica SS. Cosmae et Damianis, is the one building that the Ostrogoths are known to have given to the Roman Church, and it was given by his successors, Athalaric and Amalasuntha. Nevertheless, the repair, preservation and renovation of monuments in Rome were a component of Theoderic's patronage; they had the added value of linking him to an idealised imperial past, with which he wished to connect.[112] We cannot, therefore, preclude the notion that he repaired churches in Rome that he considered part of the Roman heritage. However, assessment of any patronage is complicated by his willingness to work through Rome-based senatorial aristocrats and to allow them to take any credit.[113]

Tiles with Theoderic's brick-stamps have been found in fifteen churches in Rome, including St Peter's, S. Mariae, four *tituli*, S. Agnae, St Paul's and the basilica in palatio sessoriano.[114] However, it is not clear that these amount to evidence of his patronage of these churches. Richard Westall argues for the king's direct involvement; he points to numerous roof-tiles bearing brick-stamps with Theoderic's name and titles which, he suggests, imply works that the *Liber* would have recorded if a pope had sponsored them.[115] Against this, Cristina La Rocca, on the basis of an analysis of Cassiodorus' *Variae*, argues that the king left construction in Rome to aristocratic competition, and the letters make no mention of competing building by popes.[116] Mark Johnson suggests the tiles may have been bought by different patrons from the *portus Licini*, a facility that the king repaired to supply 25,000 tiles annually.[117] As yet the position is unresolved. I incline to the view that Theoderic may have funded repairs to churches with imperial associations but his patronage was otherwise limited. The authors of the *Liber* may have had reasons to downplay Ostrogothic patronage, but the Amals were Arian, and beyond the need to legitimise their position by taking on the responsibility to renovate the city of

---

[111] *Anonymi Valesiani pars posterior (Excerpta Valesiana)* in J.C. Rolfe (trans.), *Ammianus Marcellinus*, Loeb Classical Library (London, 1939), vol. 3, para. 65, pp. 549-50; J.J. Arnold, *Theoderic and the Roman Imperial Restoration* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 198-200.
[112] Arnold, *Theoderic and the Roman Imperial Restoration*, pp. 198 and 224.
[113] Arnold shows how Theoderic distributed 'secret royal largesse to fund ostensible aristocratic evergetism — *Theoderic and the Roman Imperial Restoration*, pp.224-28.
[114] R. Westall, 'Theoderic Patron of the Churches of Rome?', *Acta ad archaeologiam et atrium historiam pertinentia*, 27 (2014), pp.119-38. The *tituli* were SS. Iohannis et Pauli, S. Priscae, S. Prassedis, and S. Silvestri.
[115] Westall, 'Theoderic Patron of the Churches of Rome?', p. 127.
[116] C. La Rocca, 'An Arena of Abuses and Competing Powers' in R. Balzaretti, J. Barrow and P. Skinner (eds.), *Italy and Early Medieval Europe: Papers for Chris Wickham*, The Past and Present Book Series (Oxford, 2018), pp. 201-12.
[117] Cassiodorus, Selected *Variae*, trans. S.J.B. Barnish, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 12 (Liverpool, 1992), 1.25.2, p.18; M.J. Johnson, 'Art and Architecture' in Arnold, Bjornlie and Sessa (eds.), *A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy*, p. 357 and n. 20.

Rome, the requirement to patronise the Church is not clear. Also, if Theoderic mediated his patronage through the senatorial aristocracy, it would have been filtered through the self-interest of aristocrats, which would not necessarily have coincided with the interests of the Church.

I argue that eastern emperors made very little attempt to patronise the Roman Church in the period, a position unaffected by Justinian's reconquest of Rome and Italy; I suggest that after 554 they were more inclined to become competitors. Contact between the Roman Church and eastern emperors was, in any case, limited during the Acacian schism (484-519); after normal relations resumed in 519, emperors were parsimonious. As shown in the Tables, the *Liber Pontificalis* records limited patronage from the eastern capital. In the pontificates of Hormisdas (514-23) and John I (523-25), Justin gave gospels with gold covers and precious jewels as well as ministerial vessels.[118] Justinian sent John II (533-35) a gold *scyphus*, 4 silver chalices, silver *scyphi*, and 4 purple-dyed gold-worked *pallia*.[119] These gifts would have been significant as diplomatic exchanges but, I suggest, quite limited in comparison with patronage previously delivered by western emperors. Between 476 and 604 no emperor constructed a building in Rome over which popes had control or which they could use; nor did any emperor sponsor major repairs of churches. The restoration of imperial rule after 554 saw some church building, but these constructions may have been established in competition.

After 554 the Byzantine administration founded churches in the city in the sixth century, but in no real sense were the churches part of the Roman Church; their organisational objectives were different and they did not come under papal control until later. Robert Coates-Stephens attributes churches to the Byzantine administration if they were founded after 554, they are not mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis*, and they were dedicated either to Mary or to soldier-saints.[120] His presentation of the position is persuasive. Five foundations dedicated to Mary and three to soldier-saints were started in later sixth century.[121] Dedications to Mary were a feature of Byzantine policy after the conquest.[122] Soldier-saints had typically opposed pagans, so apart from their natural appeal to the Byzantine military, their dedications were probably also intended to be an assertion of the Byzantine state's orthodoxy.[123] Some of these foundations

[118] *LP* 54. 10 and 55.7.
[119] *LP* 58.2.
[120] Coates-Stephens, 'Byzantine Building Patronage', pp. 149 and 155.
[121] The 'Theotokos foundations' were S. Mariae Antiquae, S. Mariae in Domnica, S. Mariae in Aquiro, S. Mariae in Cosmedin and S. Mariae in Via Lata. Dedications to soldier-saints included the Oratory of the 40 Martyrs, S. Theodori, SS. Sergii et Bacchi. For which see Coates-Stephens, 'Byzantine Building Patronage' pp. 154-64, and J. Moralee, *Rome's Holy Mountain* (Oxford, 2018), pp. 87-92.
[122] Coates-Stephens, 'Byzantine Building Patronage', p. 158.
[123] Theodore Tiron, the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste and Sergius and Bacchus refused to sacrifice to the gods. See C. Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition* (Abingdon, 2003), pp. 45 and 146 and Maskarinec, *City of Saints*, pp. 42-46. A possible exception to this uniform picture is Krautheimer's suggestion in *Rome: Profile of a City*, p. 70, that Narses funded SS. Iacobi et Philippi. However, I am not aware that this had been strongly argued or pursued by anyone else.

may have started to function as *diaconiae* (food distribution centres) in the sixth century although the strong evidence for this is seventh century or later. *Diaconiae* were a new phenomenon in the city, which potentially challenged the Church. If Brown is correct in his view that from the mid-fifth century popes were reaching out to the poor of Rome in a way that offered food to all in need, *diaconiae* would have offered a similar provision, and arguably in competition.[124] Popes may have dedicated these churches or centres but they did not control them.[125] No priest from them is known to have attended the synod of Rome of 595, a main indicator of constituent churches at the end of the century. Santa Maria Antiqua, the most notable of the churches, was probably not brought under the papal control before the second half of the seventh.[126] In setting up these churches, Justinian and his successors not only withheld patronage from the Roman Church but also set up an alternative, if smaller, organisation.

Aristocrats as Patrons after 476

The surviving evidence suggests very little aristocratic patronage of the Roman Church after 476. We should not be too surprised for the period after 536, as the Gothic Wars caused the senatorial aristocracy to leave the city permanently in significant numbers. However, the pattern is apparent before that date. Clearly there may be significant evidential lacunae and the example from the Laurentian Fragment, which I discuss below, is a reminder of the *Liber's* intermittent unreliability. However, I suggest that evidence reflected in the Tables 4.1-4.3 broadly matches what is known of the Church-aristocracy relationship. I argue that the period sees a developing mutual detachment, with aristocrats continuing the pre-476 trend of building private and estate churches, and the Church seeking to exclude lay influence as it repositioned itself.

Tables 4.1-3 show very little evidence of aristocratic patronage after 476. Tables 4.2 and 3 capture none. Table 4.1 suggests a few aristocratic church buildings but most of these were outside Rome and none are dated to later than 514. On the basis that where the *Liber Pontificalis* records a papal dedication, the patron responsible for construction was probably an aristocrat, we may assume three such churches in the pontificate of Gelasius I (492-96). All Gelasius's dedications (S. Euphemiae, SS. Nicandri, Eleutheri et Andreae, and S. Mariae) were established some distance from Rome (two were 20 miles away) which implies they were estate or town churches, probably controlled by aristocrats.[127] This is clearly the case with the church that the illustrious praetorian prefect Albinus and his wife Glaphyra financed and built and

[124] Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, Chapter 27, especially pp. 462-63.
[125] Coates-Stephens, 'Byzantine Building Patronage', p. 164.
[126] See *CBCR*, III, p. 267.
[127] *LP* 51.5.

which Pope Symmachus (498-514) dedicated. [128] A probable counter-example of aristocratic patronage in Rome appears in the Laurentian Fragment, a document compiled shortly after 514. It states that Symmachus built and decorated the church of S. Martini close to S. Silvestri with money from the illustrious Palatinus and, at the latter's request, dedicated it, whereas the *Liber* claims that the pope constructed the basilica SS. Silvestri et Martini from its foundations (*fundamento a construxit*).[129] As the archaeological evidence supports the idea of two buildings and the pre-existing structure was S. Silvestri, (formerly the *titulus* Equitii), the information in the Fragment seems more reliable. [130]

The focus of the aristocracy on their own churches was, I argue, accompanied by the Roman Church's attempt to exclude lay, that is aristocratic, influence in the Church. Much ink has been spilled discussing aristocrats' relationship with the Roman Church, particularly in regard to the Laurentian schism. However, I consider the issue of the *scriptura* in 483 and its reversal in 502 is very instructive. At the request of Pope Simplicius, who was concerned about the election that would follow his death, the praetorian prefect Basilius decreed that to preserve the peace (*concordia*) of the church, and to avoid putting into question the condition of the state by sedition, a papal election could not be announced without consultation (*sine nostra consultatione*).[131] He also declared in the *scriptura* that any attempt to alienate church property would be void, and subject to anathema.[132] This latter measure may have targeted candidates' expected behaviour in the anticipated election, or it may have been driven by aristocrats' concerns as to how the Church used donations that they or their families had been given for the benefit of their own souls.

The synod held in Rome in 502, during the first phase of the Laurentian schism, showed a very clear desire to exclude aristocratic influence. It declared that the *scriptura's* attempt to overlook and disempower religious people who had the greatest duty to elect a pontiff was manifestly against the canons.[133] Further, the *scriptura* could not bind the pope as only he, and not any layman, could make decisions in the Church.[134] The synod rejected the right of any layman to

---

[128] *LP*. 53.10.
[129] The Laurentian Fragment, *Le* Liber Pontificalis, 52.15. p. 46; *LP* 53.9.
[130] *LP*. 53.9. The Laurentian Fragment, 52, *Le* Liber Pontificalis, p. 46: 'Hic beati Martini ecclesiam iuxta sanctam Silvestram Palatini inlustris viri pecuniis fabricans et exornans, eo ipso instante dedicavit'; translation by Davis, *The Book of the Pontiffs*, Appendix 52.15, p. 97; *CBCR*, III, pp. 121-23.
[131] *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae*, DII, para 4, p. 445, quoted in Chapter 2, p. 56, n. 161.
[132] *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae*, DII, para 5, p. 446: 'si quis vero eorum earum rerum aliquam sub quocumque titulo atque commento alienare voluerit, inefficax atque inritum iudicetur sitque facienti vel consentienti accipientique anathema'.
[133] This is reflected in the unchallenged view of Bishop Cresconius of Tudertina, *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae* DII, para. 5, p. 445: 'Hic perpendat sancta synhodus, ut praetermissas personas religiosas, quibis maxime cura est de creando pontifice, in suam redegerint potestatem, quod contra canones esse manifestum est'.
[134] *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae*, DII, para. 8, p. 447: Bishop Laurentius of Milan: 'Ista scriptura nullum Romanae civitatis potuit obligare pontificem, quia non licuit laico statuendi in ecclesia praeter papam Romanum habere aliquam potestatem'.

declare anathema or to issue decrees in the Church.[135] On the alienation of church property that the *scriptura* also prohibited, the synod confirmed statements against lay involvement 'lest in the example of presumption it remains [open] to any layman, however religious or powerful, in whatever city, in whatever way, to determine anything concerning church wealth (*facultatibus*), whose care, it is pointed out, has been entrusted by Gods to priests alone.'[136] Collectively these decisions in the synod of 502 represent a strong rejection of aristocratic involvement.

Michele Salzman has recently argued that the *scriptura* is an indicator of significant aristocratic involvement in the Roman Church after 476, and that this engagement is further reflected in popes' subsequent use of aristocrats to manage the Church's relations with third parties.[137] I disagree on both points. First, I consider that the *scriptura* should be seen in the context of imperial action after the double election of Boniface I and Eulalius in 418/19. The situations pertaining in 418-20 and 483 were very similar. In both cases a sick pope asked the secular authority for help in avoiding conflict in an anticipated episcopal election. In 420 the emperor Honorius, at the request of Boniface I, banned election campaigning and decreed that if two candidates were elected, both should be disqualified.[138] In 483 Simplicius was ill and aware of candidates on manoeuvres. As there was no western emperor, he called on Basilius, praetorian prefect and deputy for Odoacer, the effective king of Italy (*agens etiam vices praecellentissimi regis Odovacris*).[139] Basilius exercised the role that Honorius had carried out before him. Second, after 494 popes choose clerics, not aristocrats, to represent the Church's positions on important occasions. In Table 4.4, I detail Church-aristocrat interaction between 476 and 536.[140] In the early stages of the Acacian schism popes may have used the services of senators such as Andromachus and Flavius Anicius Probus Festus Niger, particularly as they were in Constantinople on other business. However, when it came to settlement of the schism, Hormisdas's embassies comprised Italian bishops and members of the Roman Church. Popes John I and Agapetus were accompanied by aristocrats on their missions to Constantinople in 525 and 536 but these were driven by the Ostrogoths relations with the emperor, they were not essentially ecclesiastical missions.

---

[135] *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae*, DII, para. 6, p. 446. The synod replied 'Non licuit' to Bishop Maximus of Blerana's questions: '[si] licuit laico homini anathema in ordine ecclesiastico dictare aut si potuit laicus sacerdoti dicere et contra canones quod ei non competebat constituere? dicite: vobis quid videtur? de me licuit laico legem dare?'

[136] *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae*, DII, para, 11, p. 448: 'ne in exemplum remaneret praesumendi quibuslibet laicis quamvis religiosis vel potentibus in quacumque civitate quolibet modo aliquid decernere de ecclesiasticis facultatibus, quarum solis sacerdotibus diponendi indiscusse a deo cura commissa docetur'.

[137] Salzman, 'Lay Aristocrats and Ecclesiastical Politics', pp. 465-89.

[138] Dunn, 'Imperial Intervention in the Disputed Roman Episcopal Election', pp.1-13; Coleman-Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church*, 2, p. 611.

[139] *Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae*, DII, para. 4, p. 445.

[140] For Table 4.4, see the Appendix (Tables), pp. 204-05.

Table 4.4 also suggests that some aristocrats were not indifferent to the Church and the direction it took but, I consider, this cannot be taken to imply a wish to control or patronise the Church. Pope Symmachus met with nobles, including Boethius, and clergy in 512 to discuss a letter from eastern bishops about the Acacian schism.[141] Pope John II wrote in 534 to eleven senators to explain why he had accepted the theopaschite formula. However, the senators were members of the senate in Constantinople. I suggest there is no evidence to suggest that this translated into attempts to control the Church; nor are these contacts in any way indicators of patronage. [142]

The Clergy as Patrons after 476

The clergy became almost invisible as patrons between 476 and 604 as their relationship with the Church and bishop changed fundamentally. While some clerics may have continued to patronise the Church, to which the letters of Gregory I attest, I suggest that we see two phenomena that may have radically altered how clerics perceived and interacted with their institution. First, a new financial arrangement within the Church appears to have been entered into in c.475, probably as a result of the collapse of support from western emperors. Second, there are signs that the papal administration adopted the practice of payment for office, copying either the imperial bureaucracy or the eastern episcopate. Both phenomena point to a very different relationship and give an idea of how the Church may have developed in the sixth century.

I argue that the *quadripartitum*, a financial arrangement which divided the revenues of the Church equally between the bishop, the clergy, provision for the poor and pilgrims and maintenance of buildings, transformed the relationship of clergy and Church. The earliest knowledge we have of this arrangement is a letter of Pope Simplicius, sent in November 475.[143] A.H.M. Jones considered that what he called 'the dividend' could be traced back to the third century in the West, but almost all the information we have is post 475, which, I suggest, points to its new-found relevance.[144] We know that Gelasius I (492-96), Felix IV (526-30) and Gregory I (590-604) also promoted the formula.[145] A letter of Felix IV, who had been asked to

[141] Discussed in Boethius' Tractate no. 5, in *The Theological Tractates with an English Translation,* trans. H.F. Stewart and E.K. Rand, The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA, 1918).
[142] Boethius, *Theological Tractates,* no. 5, p. 72, mentioned by Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy,* p.109; John II, *Ep*. 2, *PL* 66, cols. 0011-0026; Grillmeier, *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century* (London, 1995), pp. 340-41.
[143] Simplicius, *Ep,* 1.2, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, p. 176: 'Simul etiam de reditibus ecclesiae vel oblatione fidelium quid deceat nescienti, nihil licere permittat, sed sola ei ex his quarta portio remittitur. Duae ecclesiasticis fabricis et erogationi peregrinorum et pauperum profuturae, a Bonagro presbytero sub periculo sui ordinis ministrentur; ultinam inter se clerici pro singulorum meritis dividant'.
[144] A.H.M. Jones, 'Church Finance in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries', *Journal of Theological Studies,* 11(1) (1960), pp. 84-94. Most of Jones's examples are after 475.
[145] Gelasius I, *Epp,* 16 and 17, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, pp.380-82; Felix IV, *Constitutum de Ecclesia Ravennatensi, PL* 65, cols. 0012-0016; *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, trans. with

rule on a dispute between Bishop Ecclesius of Ravenna and his clergy, gives an insight into how the formula may have operated in practice. Felix ruled that a quarter of the entire patrimony of Ravenna, so 3,000 *solidi*, should be paid to the clergy; that increases in pensions and inheritances were to be dealt with in the same way; that the clergy were to account to the bishop for acquisitions of property and family money; that auditors of the system were to be recruited from the clergy and notaries should keep the underlying documents and inventories.[146] Felix's letter shows a comprehensive system in place in Ravenna, and I suggest that we may assume similar comprehensiveness, in Rome, although not necessarily with exactly the same rules.

We do not know if Felix gave judgement on the basis of the system that operated in Rome. If he did, the Roman clergy would have had a share in the income of the 'patrimonies of St Peter'. We do not know for certain how much income they generated but had the clergy received a dividend from them, their positions would have been lucrative. What we can reasonably assume is that clerics received an income and that one target of possible clerical patronage, the maintenance and repair of building, was now provided for differently; that need was likely to have been met by the quarter allocated to buildings (*ecclesiasticis fabricis*). Whatever the extent of the *quadripartitum,* it gave them a financial interest in the Roman Church and, although this is impossible to evaluate, this may have assisted in promoting a sense of unity and engagement in the institution.

Whether or not the *quadripartitum* made a significant difference to clerics' relationship with the Church, we see much less patronage from them, although they may have continued to contribute on a scale that did not attract the attention of the editors of the *Liber Pontificalis.* In the Tables, I only record the priest Mercurius (later Pope John II)'s gift of an altar and ciborium to the *titulus* S. Clementis.[147] Apart from this, one of Gregory I's letters mentions a priest who left a property and income to fund a community of monks in Rome but which Gregory converted into a convent for nuns; another letter mentions a deacon who left unspecified property to the 'holy Roman Church'.[148] However, it is difficult to see how these last two bequests contributed to the institution of the Church, as I define it; they appear to be well under the radar of the authors of the *Liber Pontificalis.*

A second feature which, I suggest, may have significantly altered clergy-Church relations and may have led to a reduction in clerical patronage was a developing practice among the clergy to

---

Introduction and Notes by J.R.C. Martyn, Medieval Sources in Translation, no. 40, 3 vols. (Toronto, 2004), 4.11, 13.45.

[146] *Constitutum de Ecclesia Ravennatensi*, trans. D.M. Deliyannis in Agnellus of Ravenna, *The Book of the Pontiffs of the Church of Ravenna* (Washington, 2004), pp. 172-77.

[147] *LTUR*, I, 278.

[148] *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, 9.138, 9.8.

follow the eastern ecclesiastical and imperial administrative example of paying for positions. This development had two aspects: popes (and bishops) paying consecration fees and clergy paying for their positions. Payment for office was standard procedure in the imperial bureaucracy.[149] Consecration fees for bishops and clergy were also increasingly common in the East from the late fourth century onwards.[150] The Church condemned the practice in the ecclesiastical setting as simony, and had done so most recently at the Council of Chalcedon (451).[151] However, it was to be given a level of official approval by Justinian, who in 546 ruled on consecration fees, the amounts that candidates had to pay to ordaining prelate and their assistants. He declared that these payments should not be regarded as purchases but as donations.[152] For the bishop of Rome this amounted to 1,440 *solidi* or 20 pounds of gold.[153]

The amount that Pope Symmachus, or for that matter any of the other popes, paid in consecration fees is unknown but the Cononian epitome of the *Liber Pontificalis* reports that Symmachus tripled the priests' gift (*donum presbyterii*).[154] I suggest that papal elections provided opportunities for enrichment of the clergy which would explain why some popes sought to nominate their successors, and why those attempts were fiercely resisted by the clergy. The issues of nominations and payments arose in connection with the elections of 530 and 533.[155] Athalaric issued an edict in 533, which confirmed a *senatus consultum* of 530, outlining measures against malpractice, especially bribery, in contested episcopal elections. It imposed limits of 500 *solidi* on the amount that could be given to the poor, and 3,000 *solidi* that could be paid to the king's officials on the submission of documents.[156] However, the problem did not go away. When Vigilius became a viable candidate in 537, he arrived in Rome with a promise of 700 pounds of gold from the empress Theodora to assist his election.[157]

There are indications in places that the practice of paying for office, including clerical positions, established deep roots in the sixth century. The Laurentian Fragment accused Symmachus of selling ordinations, a view supported by the high number noted in the *Liber Pontificalis*: he ordained 92 priests and 16 deacons over 16 years, when at any one time Rome had formal positions for only seven deacons, and Symmachus's three predecessors had

[149] See Kelly, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire*, p. 66.
[150] S.R. Huebner, 'Currencies of Power: The Venality of Offices in the Later Roman Empire' in Cain and Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity*, pp. 174-77.
[151] Canon 2 of the Council, Price and Gaddis, *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. 3, p. 94. Also, Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, p.189.
[152] Justinian, *Novella* 123.16 (a.546), quoted by Huebner, 'Currencies of Power', p. 176.
[153] Justinian, *Novella* 123.3, 123.16 (a.546), quoted by Huebner, 'Currencies of Power', p. 176.
[154] The Cononian Epitome, 53, *Le* Liber Pontificalis, p.98: 'ampliavit clero et donum presbyterii triplicavit'.
[155] In 530 Felix IV designated Boniface who succeeded after a disputed election; between 530 and 532, Boniface unsuccessfully nominated Vigilius.
[156] Cassiodorus, *Variae*, IX, 15, *PL* 69, cols. 0778-0781.
[157] Liberatus, *Breviarum*, 22, *PL* 68, col. 1039, quoted by Moorhead, *Popes and the Church of Rome*, pp. 80 and 98, n. 59.

ordained 70 priests and 7 deacons in 15 years.[158] Pelagius I (556-61) thought it necessary to make a statement against simony at the ceremony in which he purged himself of responsibility for his predecessor's death.[159] His epitaph declared that although he ordained many ministers, he did not do so for money.[160]

The depth of the practice can, I suggest, be seen in Gregory I's attempts to eradicate simony and the subsequent reaction to his pontificate after his death. Gregory conducted a four-year campaign (594-98) against what he considered Bishop Maximus of Salona's simoniacal appointment; he elicited no support from the eastern emperor on the issue.[161] He also wrote in general terms on the evils of simony to the Frankish kings Theoderic and Theodebert, and to the bishops of Arles, Corinth, Achea and Epirus.[162] Gregory's unpopularity after his death is attributed to his populating the papal administration with monks. Alan Thacker argues that the brief entries in the *Liber Pontificalis* for the period immediately after hint at a power struggle between monastic and clerical parties.[163] I suggest that his campaigns against simony are an additional reason. They went up against a practice that appears to have become increasingly ingrained in the sixth century and for which there is some supporting evidence in the seventh. According to the *Liber,* of Gregory's fifteen immediate successors six left stipends to the clergy (described in several instances as *unam rogam integram*), and one other felt it necessary to re-issue the edict under anathema against canvassing while a pope was still alive.[164] I consider that these examples collectively point to a deep-rooted financial element in the relationship between the clergy and their bishop and Church in the sixth century and later.

I suggest that the two developments point to a changed situation after 476 which explains, in part at least, the lack of apparent clerical patronage. I consider that the *quadripartitum* was a direct response to the demise of western emperors; its emergence is certainly coincidental and it strongly suggests that there was a need to re-order the Church's finances. If its introduction or the emphasis on it slightly anticipated the deposition of the last western emperor, this may be explained by the rundown that preceded the end. It appears not be a coincidence that the information that we have about it emerges at the same time as the line of western emperors ceases. A consequence of the *quadripartitum* may have been an enhancement in the financial

---

[158] The Laurentian Fragment, 52.14, *Le* Liber Pontificalis, p. 46: 'de multis rebus fama decoloravit obscenior … necnon et de ordinibus ecclesiasticis quas palam pecuniis distrahebat'; *LP* 53.12; Moorhead, *Popes and the Church of Rome*, p. 56.
[159] *LP* 62.2.
[160] *ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4155: 'sacravit multos divina lege ministros nil pretio faciens immaculata manus'.
[161] *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, 4.20, 5.6, 5.39, 5.63, 6.3, 6.25, 6.26, 8.24 and 8.36.
[162] *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, 5.59, 5.62, 5.63, 6.7, 11.47 and 11.50.
[163] A. Thacker, 'Memorialising Gregory the Great: the origin and transmission of a papal cult in the seventh and early seventh centuries', *Early Medieval Europe*, 1(1) (1998), p. 71.
[164] *LP* 70.4 (Deusdedit, 615-18), 71.3 (Boniface IV, 619-25), 73.5 (Severinus, 640), 74.3 (John IV, 640-42), 77.1 (Eugene, 654-57), 79.1 (Adeodatus, 672-76). Boniface III (607), *LP* 68.2, issued the decree against canvassing.

value of positions in the Church. I suggest we should not underestimate the clergy's propensity to follow imperial bureaucratic practice as emulation would probably have provided an isomorphic legitimacy to the papal administration in the environment that prevailed after 476. It is noticeable that the titles *primicerius* and *secundicerius notariorum,* taken from the imperial bureaucracy, start to appear in the first half of the sixth century.[165] There is sufficient evidence to infer that the practice of making payments of assuming office or position was also followed. These factors hint at a change in the relationship between clerics and the Church that may have resulted in a considerable reduction in their role as patrons.

Papal Patronage 476-604

After 476, popes emerge as main patrons of the Roman Church with their patronage largely, but not completely directed towards their main pastoral and liturgical centres. In almost all respects the pontificate of Symmachus was exceptional. Leaving him to one side, church construction, and other patronage, was quite limited, probably driven by reduced resources. Four or five churches may have been built for reasons of prestige, but otherwise patronage was overwhelmingly directed at major basilicas, cemeterial basilicas and cemeteries. The main basilicas were important as cult sites, liturgical stations and burial places. Some cemeteries were stations as well as burial grounds. I consider that this pastoral and liturgical focus was supplemented by a new form of papal patronage, the introduction of new saint-cults and the development of existing ones. This new form had aspects in common with church construction, with which at times it was intimately connected.

Table 4.1 records the constructions of relatively few churches by popes between 476 and 604, although Symmachus's pontificate was exceptional, if the account in the *Liber* can be accepted. He was credited with eight churches and oratories, whereas Pelagius II constructed two and the other bishops built one or none. At St Peter's Symmachus built the rotunda of St Andrew with seven altars, three oratories at the basilica's font with the same names as Hilarus's oratories at the Lateran (S. Crucis, Iohannis Evangelistae and Iohannis Baptistae), as he attempted the replicate the latter during the Laurentian schism, when St Peter's was the only church he controlled. [166] In addition, the *Liber* credits him with building the basilicas S. Agathae (10 miles outside Rome), S. Pancratii (in the cemetery of Calipodius), and S. Martini, and an oratory dedicated to SS. Cosmae et Damianis near S. Mariae.[167] Of the remaining builders, Felix III, Gelasius and Anastasius II (483-98) between them only added one church, the cemeterial

[165] Dionysius Exiguus, *PL* 67, col. 0023B, addressed a letter to Bonifacius *primicerius notariorum* and Bonus *secundarius* in 526. Gregory I announced the appointment of the *primicerius* of defenders in his letter to Boniface, the first holder of the position in March 598, *The Letters of Gregory the Great,* 8.16.
[166] *LP* 53.6-7 and 53.10. Also, Moorhead, *Popes and the Church of Rome*, pp. 59-60.
[167] *LP* 53.8-9

basilica S. Agapiti near St Laurence's, to the papal portfolio of properties.[168] Hormidas (514-23)'s church in Albanum (modern Albano, 16 miles from Rome) may have been a private project as it has no known connection with the Roman Church.[169] Felix IV (526-30) converted the Temple of Romulus into the church SS. Cosmae et Damianis.[170] On the basis of a sixteenth-century inscription that records that Pope Vigilius (537-55) consecrated SS. Cyrici et Julitae, most historians attribute the foundation to him.[171] Pelagius I (556-61) started and John III (561-74) completed the church SS. Philippi et Iacobi.[172] Pelagius II (579-90) constructed the basilica *ad corpus* over the remains of St Laurence on the Via Tiburtina and transformed S. Ermetis, a cemeterial basilica in the catacombs of St Basilla on the Via Salaria Vetus.[173] Gregory I (590-604) consecrated the *magister militum* Ricimer's fifth-century Arian church and dedicated it to St Agatha.[174]

Patronage on alterations, decoration and liturgical vessels (Tables 4.2 and 4.3) appears to have been overwhelmingly distributed to the major basilicas, cemeterial basilicas and cemeteries. Anastasius II (496-98) contributed a silver *confessio* at St Laurence's. Symmachus provided accommodation for the poor (*pauperibus habitacula*) at all three major basilicas. He renewed the apse, constructed a *matroneum*, steps, a fountain and a bath at St Paul's; he also improved the cemetery of the Jordani and repaired the church S. Felicitatis in the cemetery of Maximus.[175] Hormisdas provided a silver encased beam at St Peter's and presented one silver chandelier and 16 silver chalices to the Basilica Constantiniana. John I (523-26) sponsored work on St Peter's atrium, and rebuilt (*refecit*) the cemetery of SS. Nereus and Achilleus, as well as renovating those of SS. Felix and Adauctus (Via Ardeatina), and of Priscilla (Via Salaria). Felix IV reconstructed the church S. Saturnini in the cemetery of Traso after a fire. There is a considerable gap between Boniface II and Benedict I (530-79) when popes appear to contribute very little. The *Liber* only records Pelagius I's replacement of gold and silver vessels and *pallia* in all the churches (*omnes ecclesias*), and John III's restoration of cemeteries. From inscriptions we additionally know that John II provided a Proconnesian chancel screen to the *titulus* in which he formerly served and that Pelagius I carried out work on an altar (*in altare*) at St Peter's. Mention of papal patronage in the *Liber* reappears with Pelagius II (579-90)'s gift of panels to cover Peter's body, and Gregory I's re-constructions of the *confessiones* at both St Peter's and St Paul's. Archaeological evidence also points to work carried out at the *tituli* S.

[168] *LP* 50.1.
[169] *LP* 54.1.
[170] *LP* 56.2; *ICUR*, II.1, pp. 71, 134, 152.
[171] Cardinal Alessando Medici restored the church in 1584. Any original inscription is now lost. What survives is the later inscription which refers to the consecration by Vigilius. See *CBCR*, IV, p. 38.
[172] *LP* 62.3 and 63.1.
[173] *LP* 65.2; *ICUR*, II.1, pp. 63, 106, 157.
[174] *LP* 66.4.
[175] *LP* 53.8, 53.10-11.

Marcelli, S. Chrysogoni and S. Marci which popes may have sponsored in the sixth century but the precise dates are uncertain.

The notable feature of the patronage was a significant focus on major basilicas, cemeterial basilicas and cemeteries. There are six, possibly five, churches outside this categorisation: Symmachus's oratory near S. Mariae, S. Martini, S. Pancratis, SS. Cosmae et Damianis, SS. Cyrici et Julitae, and SS. Philippi et Iacobi. Of these I exclude Symmachus's S. Agathae and Hormisdas's basilica in Albanum as they were some distance outside Rome. There is a possible case for excluding S. Martini as the Laurentian Fragment claims that it was financed by the *vir illustris* Palatinus. The remainder may be considered churches built for reasons of prestige. Leaving this small group of churches aside, popes focused on major basilicas, cemeterial basilicas and cemeteries. I suggest that major basilicas were central to pope's concerns for three reasons: they were the most significant cult sites and pilgrim attractions; they constituted major stations (*stationes*) for liturgy; and they were situated on prestigious burial sites. Stations were churches or places where the bishop or his representative presided over the Church's main liturgical celebration of the day; stational liturgy had become established in Rome by the mid-to-late fifth century.[176] Some cemeteries and cemeterial basilicas, apart from fulfilling their basic function, were also stations.

St Peter and St Paul were the main cults in Rome with St Laurence not far behind, if not equal. Simplicius's provision of clergy from the regions to administer confession and baptism at their basilicas, and Symmachus's construction of accommodation for the poor at the three sites hint at the volume of regular visitors. Gregory I's alterations to the *confessiones* at St Peter's and St Paul's were designed to give some, but not too close, access, to congregations and pilgrims. Pelagius II's construction of the basilica *ad corpus* was similarly designed to enhance access to Laurence: the work eliminated the narrow approaches to the tomb and replaced the catacomb galleries with larger hall, capable of holding a sizeable congregation.[177] Almost by definition these basilicas were also stations. Little formal acknowledgement has survived from the fifth and sixth centuries that the major basilicas were stations but the *Liber* records Hormisdas's gift to St Paul's of 6 silver *scyphi* for stational use. Later evidence, for instance *ordines* such as the *Comes* of Würzburg, suggests that the major basilicas, as well as S. Mariae and the Basilica Constantiniana, were the core of the system.[178]

[176] Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship,* p. 151.
[177] *CBCR,* II, pp. 135 and 143.
[178] Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship,* pp. 125 and 153-56. Baldovin states that all major basilicas and all but three *tituli* appear in the earliest lists as stations in Lent (p. 153). For Ember Days the stations were S. Mariae, SS. Iacobi et Philippi, and St Peter's (p. 155); for Easter Week they were the Basilica Constantiniana, St Peter's, St Paul's, St Laurence's, SS. Iacobi et Philippi and, a later interpolation, S. Mariae ad martyres (p.156).

The complexes in which the three basilicas were located were major burial sites and, as such, were important bases of operations of the bishops of Rome. Both St Peter's and St Paul's were built over parts of necropolises in which the apostles were considered to be buried. Constantine built the first church to St Laurence on imperial land close to two catacombs, those of Cyriaca and S. Hippolytus, in the first of which Laurence was thought to have been buried. The three basilicas offered the added attraction of burial close to an apostle or the next most venerated saint. By the first quarter of the sixth century popes began to control these sites through *praepositi*, whose prime functions were to sell burial lots, manage endowments and donations and to provide lighting.[179] They probably replaced *cubicularii* whom Leo I had earlier established as wardens over the tombs of Peter and Paul.[180] The first extant references to *praepositi* in inscriptions are in 523 (St Peter's), 511 (St Paul's), and 523-6 (St Laurence's).[181] Some of the inscriptions indicate that several *solidi* were paid for each *locus*, but, as I suggest above in relation to St Peter's in the fifth century, the true financial benefit probably came from the repeated fees for anniversary commemorations.[182]

In the sixth century at St Peter's had ceased to be a burial site for all but a privileged few, as it became a mausoleum for popes. Silvagni has captured only ten inscriptions for the period 476-577, of which three recorded the deaths of aristocrats and one a subdeacon.[183] However, I suggest that the Vatican crypt and surrounding area would have had an ongoing relevance for families already established there. St Paul's, built to honour the apostle and to announce the arrival of the new dynasty, also met the rising demand for Christian burial, for which Paul's tomb was a 'magnet'. The interior could have accommodated approximately 6,400 burials under the pavement and hundreds of sarcophagi above it.[184] A census of dated epitaphs suggests that St Paul's was among the most popular burial basilicas.[185] Silvani records 128 dated inscriptions for the years 476 to 551, of which 8 refer to persons of *clarissimus, spectabilis* or *illustris* rank.[186] The extant inscriptions suggest that area around St Laurence's attracted fewer elite depositions. Silvagni only captured two inscriptions for aristocrats and one for a member of the equestrian order for the years 476-564 but there are seven undated ones

[179] Camerlenghi, *St Paul's Outside the Walls,* p. 105.
[180] *LP* 47.8.
[181] *ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4184 (Transmundus at St Peter's), *ICUR*, I, no. 957 (Petrus at St Paul's), and *ICUR-NS*, VII, nos. 17615 and 17617 (Stephanus at St Laurence's).
[182] Both *ICUR-NS*, II, nos. 5172 and 5173 refer to purchases from a *praepositus* at St Paul's and indicate that *solidi* and *tremesses* were paid but there is no clear indication as to quantum.
[183] *ICUR-NS*, II, nos. 4178-4187, but especially 4178 (Mustila, *spectabilis femina*), 4183 (Titianus, *vir spectabilis*) and 4187 (Micinus, *cancellarius illustris*, or a *cancellarius* of an *illustris*).
[184] Camerlenghi, *St Paul's Outside the Walls,* pp. 77-78.
[185] Anna Maria Nieddu, 'L'utilizzazione funeraria del suburbio nei secoli V e VI,' in P. Pergola, R. Santangeli, R.S. Valenzani and R. Volpe (eds.) *Suburbium*: *Il suburbio di Roma dalla crisi del Sistema delle ville a Gregorio Magno*, pp. 548-96; quoted by Camerlenghi, *St Paul's Outside the Walls*, pp.92 and 305, n. 44. Selected cemeteries and cemeterial basilicas shared these elements but to a lesser degree.
[186] *ICUR-NS*, II, nos. 4970-5098. Those of aristocrats are 4983, 5002 (two burials), 5030, 5032, 5040, 5092, 5093.

and arguably some or all refer to deaths in this period.[187] While the inscriptions on their own imply that St Laurence's did not match St Paul's in appeal, I suggest that the development of the area by Sixtus III and Hilarus, the burial in the church of three of the six popes who reigned between 417 and 468, and Pelagius II's church over the body of Laurence show a sustained attempt to enhance the area as a burial location.

The number of references in the *Liber* to popes' renovations and improvements of cemeteries suggests that they merit attention as part of the Church's organisation. Very obviously, they shared with the major basilicas the function of a burial site. A number of them were also stations. J.F. Baldovin, on the basis of an analysis of Gregory I's *Forty Gospel Homilies,* identifies nine cemeterial basilicas that on particular dates functioned as stations and, I suggest, it is reasonable to conclude that the practice at those or other cemeterial basilicas was regular. It is noteworthy that of the nine stations identified, four were renovated or repaired by Gregory's predecessors in the sixth century, three by Symmachus and one by John I: S. Felicitatis (Gregory's Homily 3), S. Agnae (Homily 11), St Pancratii (Homily 27) and SS. Nerei and Achillei (Homily 23).[188] Cemeteries were also probably controlled by popes through the *tituli*, in a manner that echoed the role of *praepositi*. Priests of the *tituli* S. Chrysogoni and S. Vitalis (Vestinae) were placed in charge of S. Pancratii and S. Agnae.[189] Less strong evidence points to the clergy of S. Pudentianae, SS. Iohannis et Pauli and SS. Nerei and Achillei being responsible for the cemeteries of S. Hippolytus, S. Sebastianus and Domitilla respectively.[190] If at one time the clergy had independent control of the cemeteries, I suggest that this would have been eroded by papal investment. Gregory I's replacement of the S. Chrysogoni clergy at S. Pancratii attests to papal control.[191]

The pontificate of Symmachus aside, the scale of patronage suggests that resources throughout the period were limited. Symmachus's building programme may have impoverished the Roman Church. Ennodius recorded that he had difficulty repaying a loan of 400 *solidi* from the bishop of Milan.[192] As already noted, the Laurentian Fragment accused him of selling ordinations. Pope Agapetus (536-37) also experienced financial difficulties: he had to pawn the church plate to finance his journey to Constantinople in 536.[193] None of the constructions and alterations in

[187] The absence of dates may be due to the end of the western consulship in 536 and/or the destruction of part of the catacomb in the thirteenth-century rebuilding when the eastern part of the current church was built.
[188] Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship,* p. 124.
[189] *LP* 42.7 for S. Vitalis/S. Agnae. *ICUR,* I, nos. 975 and 977, c.521-25, indicate purchases of burial places (*loca*) in the cemetery S. Pancratii from priests of S. Chrysogoni.
[190] Prudentianae/S. Hippolitus, *CBCR,* III, p. 280; SS. Iohannis et Pauli/S. Sebastianus, *ICUR,* II.1, p. 32; SS. Nerei and Achillei/Domitilla, *CBCR,* III, p. 137. Each of these is an inference drawn from inscriptions relating to burials in the cemeteries.
[191] *The Letters of Gregory the Great,* 4.18.
[192] Ennodius, *Epp.* 3.10.3, 4.11.2 and 6.33.2, *PL* 63, cols. 57, 75, 106-7, and 112, quoted by Moorhead, *The Popes and the Church of Rome*, pp. 55-56.
[193] Cassiodorus, Selected *Variae,* XII, 20, p.173-74; Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy,* p.126.

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 suggests vast expenditures. All the churches were relatively small. Pelagius II's new basilica *ad corpus* at St Laurence's was 30 metres long compared with the existing Constantinian *basilica maior's* 100 metres, and the fifth-century S. Mariae's 75 metres.[194] It was, however, luxuriously decorated, 'all the more remarkable for being built in difficult times'.[195] Three churches (SS. Cosmae et Damianis, S. Agathae Gothorum and SS. Cyrici et Julitae) were conversions of existing buildings, and as such were likely to have involved less expense than a new build.[196] The is little evidence of the use of marble, which 'equalled magnificence' and cost and mattered more than mosaics.[197] We only know that Symmachus decorated St Peter's with marble and provided marble adornments at its fountain, that Felix IV or a sixth-century successor installed a marble altar in S. Cosmae et Damianis, and that John II procured a Proconnesian marble chancel screen for S. Clementis.[198] As the authors of the first edition mention Sixtus III's, Hilarus's and Symmachus's use of porphyry or marble, I suggest that their and their successors' silence on other occasions should be taken as evidence that they were not used. This position in Rome should be contrasted with contemporary building in Ravenna where S. Apollinaris Nuovo, built by Theoderic, would have required 150 tonnes of marble for the columns alone; S. Vitale (constructed 526-47), financed by the banker Julianus Argentarius, would have needed 188 tonnes, and S. Apollinaris in Classe (constructed 534-49) would have required similar tonnage of Proconnesian marble for its 24 columns.[199] James calculates that, in total, constructions in Ravenna in the sixth century required 1,556 tonnes of marble.[200]

In summary, I suggest that there were two strands to papal patronage after 476: some church construction attributable to a desire to engender prestige, but more related to the Church's pastoral and liturgical functions in the city. The two strands were not mutually exclusive but I consider that the difference matters. Symmachus's activities were exceptional and make it difficult to fit him into the overall pattern. They are best explained by his need to establish his legitimacy during and after the bruising Laurentian schism. It is important to appreciate the major basilicas as the key centres where the Church fulfilled its responsibilities to the

[194] Ward-Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, pp. 58-59.
[195] Brandenburg, *Ancient Churches of Rome*, pp. 238-39.
[196] Krautheimer, *CBCR*, I, p. 142, considered that Felix IV only decorated the apse with the mosaic and added furniture; Liz James, *Mosaics in the Medieval World from Late Antiquity to the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2017), p.250, suggests that he 'preserved and increased the original precious marbles of the original temple'. Krautheimer, *CBCR*, IV, p. 50, considered that SS. Cyrici et Julitae was a rare example of a construction *de novo*, but Brandenburg, *Ancient Churches of Rome*, p. 233, mentions that excavations of the 1930s suggest it was a sixth century conversion of a single aisled brick hall, with modest dimensions (22 metres long and 12 wide).
[197] James, *Mosaics in the Medieval World*, p. 108.
[198] *LTUR*, I, 278.
[199] James, *Mosaics in the Medieval World* p. 108; Deliyannis, *Ravenna in late* Antiquity, pp. 148-49 (S. Apollinaris Nuovo), pp. 231-36 (S. Vitalis), pp. 263-64 (S. Apollinaris in Classe).
[200] James, *Mosaics in the Medieval World* p. 108.

inhabitants of the city and pilgrims. Through the recipients of patronage, basilicas and cemeteries, we get a sense of the Church's coverage over the entire city. It produces a map that is intelligible in terms of pastoral responsibilities, not aspirations for secular rule. There is an overall sense of limited resources and of the institution optimising the use of its major assets. In this environment, popes introduced a new form of patronage and it is not surprising that, in constrained circumstances, it was not very costly and it dovetailed with an existing form, church constructions.

New Saint-Cults: A New Form of Papal Patronage

I argue that the introduction of non-Roman saints and the development of certain Roman cults crystallised as another form of patronage after c.476. Introductions were not entirely novel but starting in the second half of the fifth century, a different approach was apparent, driven in large part by what Robert Wiśniewski calls the 'explosion' of the phenomenon of relics.[201] Historians have opined on the political aspects of this development; here I address the patronal aspects. [202] I consider that the patronal offering had four elements: popes presenting as donors in a way that was directly comparable to their position as constructors of church building; popes asserting their piety and fitness as intercessors with saints; the gift of opportunities to seek intercession; and provision of an intense religious and spiritual experience. I suggest that popes took advantage of the increasing belief in relics and in the intercessory power of saints. I also suggest that this approach, with the same patronage implications, was applied, in part at least, to the existing cults of Saints Peter, Paul, Laurence and Pancras. In examining this development, I consider Symmachus' new cults at the basilica of St Andrew, Felix IV's significant insertion of the cult of Cosmas and Damian in the Forum Romanum, Pelagius II's construction of a new church to St Laurence on the Via Tiburtina and the development of the existing cult of St. Pancras.

---

[201] R. Wiśniewski, *The Beginnings of the Cult of Relics* (Oxford, 2019), p.2.

[202] For the political aspects of new saint-cults at the Rotunda and of SS Cosmae and Damianis, see J.D. Alchermes, 'Petrine Politics: Pope Symmachus and the Rotunda of St Andrew at Old St Peter's', *The Catholic Historical Review,* 81 (1995), pp. 1-40 but particularly pp. 32-35. Alchermes argues that Symmachus's primary goal in laying out the Rotunda was to secure relics of bishoprics whose occupants opposed him during the Laurentian schism. Goodson, 'Building for Bodies: The Architecture of Saint Veneration in Early Medieval Rome' in E. Ó Carragain and C.N. de Vegvar (eds.), *Roma Felix: Formation and Reflections of Medieval Rome,* Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West (Aldershot, 2007), p. 60, considers that the altars housing these relics represented 'a web of geographical and topographical associations', and that the relics expressed Symmachus's 'network of political allegiances. W. Meyer, 'Antioch and the Intersection between Religious Factionalism, Place and Power in Late Antiquity' in Cain and Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity*, pp. 357-67, especially p. 365, considers the cult of Cosmos and Damian can be interpreted as a statement of Rome's orthodoxy in opposition to the imperial position. See also, Maskarinec, *City of Saints*, pp. 32-37, and P. Booth, 'Orthodox and Heretic in the early Byzantine cult(s) of Saints Cosmos and Damian' in P. Sarris, M. Dal Santo and P. Booth (eds.) *Age of Saints?* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 114-28.

The fifth century saw the introduction of a few non-Roman saints, although arguably most of these were special cases. Up until then saints venerated in Rome were overwhelming 'Roman', whether by birth or by virtue of their martyrdom in the city. Pope Damasus (366-84), by systematically placing inscriptions at many of the martyrs' burial sites, made much of their Roman identity. Table 4.5 details changes over the fifth and sixth centuries.[203] The fifth century saw the beginning of the introduction of new saint-cults by popes or by others in partnership with popes: that of Mary at the basilica of S. Mariae; of Saints Gervase and Protase at S. Vitalis (*titulus* Vestinae); of Stephen at Demetrias's estate church on the Via Latina, at an oratory at the Lateran and at S. Stephani in celio monte; and of St John the Evangelist and St John the Baptist at other oratories at the Lateran. The dedication to Mary followed the Council of Ephesus (431) at which she was declared *Theotokos* (Mother of God). It is not clear from the *Liber* whether the dedication of Vestina's church was determined by Innocent I or by the aristocratic lady but, given the extent to which she funded it, it was probably her choice. The dedications to Stephen were almost certainly part of the empire-wide adoption of his cult following the discovery of his relics in 415. Neither of the Saints John are known to have previously had a church or shrine dedicated to them in Rome, although Ravenna had had both such churches since the first half of the fifth century.[204] Collectively these new dedications do not suggest a concerted effort to introduce new saints.

Symmachus introduced more non-Roman saints than any other pope in the sixth century. At the basilica of St Andrew (the Rotunda) he introduced seven cults, of which we know six from inscriptions and the *Liber Pontificalis*: the apostles Andrew and Thomas; Apollinaris (the first bishop of Ravenna); Sossus (a deacon from Campania); Cassian of Imola; the brothers Protus and Hyacinth. Of these, Andrew was already venerated at the church dedicated by Pope Simplicius for Valila, and an inscription of Damasus, found at the cemetery of Basilla, attests to a cult of the brothers from at least the last quarter of the fourth century; otherwise, formal veneration of these saints appears to have been new in Rome. Symmachus also constructed two other churches and an oratory, and dedicated them to Saints Martin of Tours, Agatha and Cosmas and Damian, none of whom are known to have been previously formally venerated in Rome. Two of these last cults were re-introduced later in the sixth century: Felix IV (526-30) dedicated the significant conversion of a state building in the Forum Romanum to Cosmas and Damian, and Gregory I dedicated the Arian Gothic church to Agatha in c.594. Other papal introductions were SS. Cyrici and Julitae, (Pope Vigilius) and SS. Philippi et Iacobi (Pelagius I and/or John III). Either Pelagius I or Pelagius II introduced the cult of the Maccabees.[205] As I

[203] For Table 4.5, see the Appendix (Tables), pp. 206-09.
[204] Deliyannis, *Ravenna in Late Antiquity*, pp. 62-63.
[205] An inscription records the arrival of their relics in S. Pietri in Vincoli in the second half of the century but it does not make clear which Pelagius.

show in Table 4.5, in almost all cases the dedications were accompanied by the installation of relics, indicated usually by the presence of *confessiones*; these relics could be corporeal, contact or instrumental.[206]

Of these new dedications after 476, extant inscriptions from Symmachus's Rotunda, and inscriptions and apse and triumphal arch mosaics in SS. Cosmae et Damianis and St Laurence's give a few insights into new saint-cults as a new form of patronage. Of Symmachus's seven new cults, four dedicatory inscriptions survive, one of which relates to the entire construction**.** The church SS. Cosmae et Damianis is notable for its apse mosaic in which a pope appears for the first time. The church had been a secular hall in a building associated with the practice of medicine; the saints were eastern martyrs who, as *anargyroi*, were healers who would not accept payment. The figures in the mosaic are Christ standing between Peter and Paul, each flanked by Cosmas and Damian who, in turn, had Pope Felix IV and St Theodore Tiron at their sides. The group appears together in paradise: the mosaic depicts palm trees and a phoenix, motifs of paradise and resurrection. Some of these features are replicated in the triumphal arch mosaic in the new basilica that Pelagius II erected for St Laurence on the Via Tiburtina. Like Felix, Pelagius appears in a company of saints (Peter, Paul, Laurence, Stephen, Hippolytus); Laurence seems to introduce him.[207] Both popes are shown holding models of their churches; both churches have dedicatory inscriptions.

In all three situations popes declared their patronage of the cults in ways that were calculated to garner the prestige that attached to church construction. In the two cases where a cult was introduced, it is clearer that their patronage was of the cult; in the third it seems more obviously of the building. The inscription which refers to the entire construction of S. Andreae declared Symmachus a 'confessor of holy honour' and asserted that the '[saints'] enduring renown [is] enhanced by [his] pious inscriptions'.[208] The dedication to the deacon Sossus recorded that 'Bishop Symmachus, the consecrator of such an honour, has made this [to be] commemorated by his inscriptions'.[209] The third text stated: 'To the holy martyrs, Protus and Hyacinth, Symmachus has paid this tribute and adorned the monument beneath which he has again placed

[206] *The Book of the Pontiffs,* p. 111 defines *confessio* as 'an area in front of an altar above a martyr's tomb, excavated to give closer access to, or sight of, the grave'. Contact relics are cloth whose sanctity derives from contact with corporeal parts or from the absorption of atmosphere around the body; instrumental relics are those used in the martyrdom, for St. Laurence's grill. See C. Goodson, 'Building for Bodies', pp. 66-67.
[207] Caillet, J-P., 'Dedicator's Image in the Church Space (4th-7th centuries): the emergence of a visual system of theocratic power', *Antiquité Tardive,* 19 (2001), p. 161.
[208] *ICUR-NS,* II, no 4109: 'Quam tamen antistes sancti confessor honoris / Et meritis suis voluit nobilitare suis'; translation by Alchermes, 'Petrine Politics', p.21.
[209] *ICUR-NS,* II, 246-47, No 8a: 'Symmachus antistes tanti sacrator honoris / Haec fecit titulis commemoranda suis'; translation by Alchermes, 'Petrine Politics', p. 27.

their blessed bodies…'[210] These statements, in three of the four extant texts, suggest that Symmachus would have been similarly mentioned in some of the others. The foundation inscription of SS. Cosmae et Damianis makes clear that the pope's patronage includes the cult: 'From the martyr-physicians' unshakeable hope has come to the people and the place has grown by virtue of [its] sacred honour. Felix has offered to the Lord this gift, worthy of a bishop, that he may live in the heights of heaven.' Laurence was not a new cult but the new basilica *ad corpus* was, I suggest, a similar investment. The inscription for the new construction asserts Pelagius's patronage: 'the Pontiff consecrated these [structures] to his [Laurence's] merits' and 'The martyr Laurence long ago determined that such precious temples would be given to him by Bishop Pelagius.'[211]

I suggest that the core components of this new form of patronage were popes' self-presentation as worthy intercessors and the faithful's wish for intercession and/or salvation. As mentioned, three of the four dedicatory inscriptions asserted Symmachus's piety and his relationship to the saints; for instance, he was a sufficient 'confessor of holy honour' that the saints' enduring renown would be enhanced by his inscriptions.[212] Felix's position among the Christ and the saints was novel Although, as Caillet observes, he stands to one side of the main group, his position mirrors that of Theodore, implying his equal status with that saint. [213] His offer of the church, while three saints offer their crowns, equates his gift with their martyrdoms.[214] The image strongly implied that the pope belonged in the company of saints in paradise, or would do so in the future and, I argue, implicitly asserts his status as an intercessor. The apse mosaic at St Laurence's did not survive the thirteenth-century rebuilding and a little less can be read into the triumphal arch mosaic. Nevertheless, in the mosaic Pelagius similarly appears in the company of Christ and saints. His relationship with Laurence is more intimate than Felix's with Cosmas and Damian.[215] He presents a model church opposite Hippolytus who is holding a martyr's crown which, if original, would again equate the donation of a church with martyrdom. I suggest that both mosaics particularly aimed to present the popes in the company of saints and imply that they could intercede for the onlooker and provide opportunities for his or her salvation.

---

[210] *ICUR-NS,* II, no 4106: 'Martiribus sanctis Proto pariterque Hiacyntho / Simmachus (sic) hoc parvo beneratus honore patronos / Exornabit opus sub quo pia corpora rursus'; translation by Alchermes, 'Petrine Politics', p. 23.
[211] *ILCV,* I, no. 1770; translation by Thunø, *The Apse Mosaic in Early Medieval Rome: Time, Network and Repetition* (Cambridge, 2015), p.213.
[212] *ICUR-NS,* II, no 4109: 'Symmache quapropter vivax iam fama per aevum / Narrabit titulis amplificata piis'. Translation by Alchermes, 'Petrine Politics', p.21.
[213] Caillet, 'Dedicator's Image', p. 159.
[214] Thunø, *The Apse Mosaic in Early Medieval Rome,* p. 152.
[215] Caillet, 'Dedicator's Image', p. 161.

The presence of saints in their relics provided opportunities for intercession, and even held out hope for salvation. Table 4.5 shows a high incidence of knowledge of relics, in which at the time there was increasing confidence in their efficacy.[216] In general, worshippers sought saints' help on a variety of matters. Raymond Van Dam observes that a high priority for those about whom Gregory of Tours wrote his miracle stories was the restoration of health.[217] Wiśniewski argues that people also sought saints' interventions to expel demons, to reveal hidden things (divination), and to defend cities; some also arranged to be buried near saints (*ad sanctos*) to obtain their intercession after death.[218] The inscriptions at S. Andreae and St Laurence's are not very informative as to the specific intercessory appeal of the saints, beyond the fact that they were martyrs. In dedicating the basilica to Cosmas and Damian, Felix more explicitly offered the opportunity for worshippers to seek intercession for healing: in the mosaic the saints hold medical doctors' bags, and the dedicatory inscription claimed that the 'unshakeable hope of being healed has come to the people'.[219] The presence in the mosaic of Theodore Tiron, also known as a healing saint, arguably underscored the promise of healing. [220] Diane Apostolos-Cappadona goes further. Noting the votive nature of the gift, she argues that the Church and apse mosaic might best be interpreted as 'visualising the promise of eternal salvation for both the congregants of this particular community, and especially of this pope'.[221]

I argue that the fourth and final component in this new form of patronage was the enhancement of the space or ambience in which intercession was to be sought, and of the religious experience. The inscription commemorating S. Andreae describes the visual and spiritual experience intended for the believer: 'The shrine sparkles more brightly with faith than with the gleam of polished stone (*luce metalli*) and the building shines, constructed by the law of the thunderer. Those like-minded who forever hold the heavenly realms, a single house of faith has joined as well on earth, a house which … the bishop … also wished to ennoble with accounts of [the saints'] merits.'[222] I suggest that this sense of spiritual power in the building, which called on the symbolism of light, would have been enhanced by the presence of multiple relics in the one place. Through relics, the pope offered opportunities for a more immediate

---

[216] Wiśniewski, *The Beginnings of the Cult of Relics*, pp. 27-47.
[217] R. Van Dam, *Saints and their Miracles in late Antique Gaul*, (Princeton, 1993), Chapter 3.
[218] Wiśniewski, *The Beginnings of the Cult of Relics*, p. 27.
[219] On the medical bags see B. Brenk ,'Apses, Icons and "Image Propaganda" before Iconclasm' in *Antiquité Tardive*, 19 (2011), pp. 109-30. Inscription: De Rossi, *ICUR*, II.1: 71,134,152, translation by Thunø, *The Apse Mosaic in Early Medieval Rome*, p.209.
[220] Walter, *The Warrior Saints*, p. 45.
[221] D. Apostolos-Cappadona, '"Decorated with luminous mosaics": Image and Liturgy in 5th/6th-Century Roman Church Apse Mosaics', in *Studia Patristica*, 71 [J. Day and M. Vincent (eds.), Papers presented at Conferences on *Early Roman Liturgy to 600*, (14.11.2009-27.02.2010)], p. 109.
[222] *ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4109: 'Templa micant plus compta fide quam luce metalli / Constructumque nitet lege tonatis opus / Concordes quos regna tenant caelestia semper / Iunxit et in terries una domus fidei / Quam tamen anstites ……. / Et meritis voluit nobilitare suis', translation by Alchermes, 'Petrine Politics', p. 21.

contact with the saints. Pope Felix IV developed this further in his transformation of SS. Cosmae and Damianis. Historians have already observed the strong message of salvation and motifs of paradise that that pervade its mosaic. Christ was presented no longer as the philosopher-teacher of the early fifth-century, as in the mosaic in S. Pudentianae, but as a salvific figure, the resurrected Saviour.[223] Erik Thunø presents a visual interpretation of the experience of worshipping in the basilica: the pope in the apse was a bridge across time and space between saints and the congregation; while the saints reached down from heaven, the worshippers aspired upwards and heaven and earth merged in 'a new, united, ecclesiological reality'.[224]

The loss of the apse mosaic at St Laurence's prevents a reconstruction of how the altar may have appeared but it is probable that the building offered a similar experience to that described above at SS. Cosmae et Damianis. The inscription at St Laurence's refers to light: 'As the Lord supplemented darkness with created light, so [here] brilliance as of a thunderbolt rests on things once hidden'.[225] The basilica was also designed to improve access to the body of Laurence for worshippers and pilgrims. It replaced the narrow approach to the tomb, catacomb galleries and possibly an underground area by a larger hall, filled with light, which was capable of holding a sizeable congregation.[226]

St Pancras provides a very different example of a cult developed in acts of papal patronage. which resulted in enhancement of the cemetery as a burial place and the production of relics for distribution by popes. Apart from a mention in the fifth-century *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, nothing is known of his cult before Symmachus built a basilica and a bath, and provided a silver arch weighing 15lbs. Beyond the period under consideration, Honorius I (625-38) rebuilt the church on a larger scale, increasing it from some 30 metres to 55, but he probably also destroyed any dedicatory inscriptions or mosaics, so we are not able to appreciate how Symmachus and later popes presented their patronage. However, it was clearly a successful papal saint-cult. Pancras's intercessory appeal was as a diviner of 'hidden things.' Gregory of Tours attested to his reputation in the late sixth century as a powerful avenger of perjurers.[227] Gregory I replaced the priests of the *titulus* S. Chrysogoni with monks and an abbey, closely attached to the church, to ensure the continuity of services.[228] The cemetery

[223] On Christ as philosopher-teacher: Brenk, 'Apses, Icons and "Image Propaganda"', p. 112; Apostolos-Cappadona, '"Decorated with luminous mosaics'", p. 104.
[224] Thunø, , *The Apse Mosaic in Early Medieval Rome*, pp. 81-82.
[225] *ILCV*, 1770, translation by Thunø, *The Apse Mosaic in Early Medieval Rome*, p.213.
[226] *CBCR*, II, pp. 135-36.
[227] Gregory of Tours, *Glory of the Martyrs*, trans. with Introduction by R. Van Dam, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 4 (Liverpool, 1988), n. 38, p.60; *LP* 62.2.
[228] On the relationship of the monastery to the church, see Martyn, *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, 4.18. Gregory wrote to Maurus, abbot of St Pancras, stating: 'We should … establish a community of monks in the monastery adjacent to the same church … so that the abbot in charge there should have

attracted some elite burials.[229] The frequency with which Gregory I distributed Pancras's relics attests to his high status as a papal cult: Conrad Leyser shows that Gregory did so on four occasions compared with three for Peter and two for Paul.[230] Inter alia, patronage of the cult resulted in control over its relics.

The detailed evidence for new cults and the development of existing ones is limited but, I suggest, some extrapolation is reasonable. The list compiled by Leyser suggests that that popes invested in some but not all the cults in Rome. Further, there is a strong correlation between the fourteen saints on the list, whose relics were requested from Gregory I, and churches dedicated to them, which were built or repaired or enhanced in the sixth century. Among the constructions are Agatha, Hermes, Hyacinth, Laurence, Pancras; among the enhancements Peter, Paul, Stephen, John and Paul. Additionally, Gregory was asked for permission was for the dedication of a shrine to Cyriacus.[231] I suggest that some or all of the features set out in regard to SS. Cosmae et Damianis, St Laurence's and S. Pancratii, would have in present in other churches that received popes' patronage. I consider that Gregory I's modifications to the *confessiones* at St Peter's and St Paul's, which allowed structured access for worshippers and pilgrims, should be seen in this context. As these cases show, popes clearly wished to assert their position as patrons of cults, a motive that, I consider, was very evident in Gregory I's placement of a bronze engraving of his letter to the sub-deacon Felix in the narthex of St Paul's, which established an endowment to fund lighting in the basilica.[232] The essence of this new form of patronage was the provision of opportunities to seek saints' intercession and intervention. However, I suggest that the 'gift' went beyond the simple opportunity for intercession; popes attempted to create an ambience that made the possibility of intercession more credible, in the process enhancing the experience for the believer. The references to 'light' in the inscriptions and Gregory's provision of lighting were not accidental.

---

total care and concern over the aforesaid church. … But take care over this before all else, that each day the work of God is carried out there … before the most sacred body of Saint Pancras'.

[229] Three inscriptions record the burials of two persons of equestrian rank (in 522), one *vir clarissimus* (between 542 and 565) and one *spectabilis femina* (in 543)— *ICUR-NS*, II, nos. 4280, 4286, 4287. The fact that the cemetery had a *praepositus* also implies its high status as a burial ground. Also, *ICUR*, II, no. 4279.

[230] See the Table in C. Leyser, 'Roman martyr piety in the age of Gregory the Great', *Early Medieval Europe*, 9.3 (2000), p. 301. For Letter 11.5 in Leyser's Table read the related 9.233. Leyser lists 14 saints and shows separately information requests for relics and permission for dedications. If both categories are added, Gregory responded five times with reference to Pancras, and four times and twice in regard to Peter and Paul.

[231] Martyn, *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, 9.166.

[232] Martyn, *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, 14.14.

Conclusion

This examination of patronage started with the hypothesis that the end of the line of western emperors had a significant impact on the institution of the Roman Church. I have deliberately focused on the Church as an institution in Rome because I consider that there was a core institution which had an existence of its own, and examination of it and its experience of patronage would yield meaningful conclusion. I also consider the *Liber Pontificalis* is the history of the institution, not of Rome, and it should be examined in that light. The *Liber* has long been considered biased in favour of demonstrating papal patronage. That judgement must remain. However, if the text is accepted as an institutional history, the omission of, say, the Byzantine administration's churches should be less surprising. Overall, the paucity of evidence has been a problem but, I suggest, some conclusions are possible.

Some scholars emphasise the isomorphic aspect of papal patronage, aligning it with imperial and senatorial patronage in Rome. Unquestionably, this element existed. However, I consider that there is a danger that this detracts from an appreciation of the Church as an ecclesiastical institution. Thomas Noble has observed that 'the routine business of papal government, and the duties of the pope as an Italian metropolitan, always took precedence over everything else'.[233] I consider that a similar view of the Roman Church emerges from this analysis of patronage. Most of the patronage was directed to places that helped to fulfil the bishop's and the Church's pastoral and liturgical responsibilities in Rome. In introducing new saint-cults, popes sought to engage with the people of Rome in a religious and ecclesiastical milieu. I consider that this analysis suggests that more attention should be paid to functional and religious elements of the Church as an ecclesiastical institution.

The relationship of the aristocracy and the Church also features strongly in the scholarship. I have argued that the relationship was more nuanced than has been acknowledged to date and it does not follow that conversion resulted in patronage. Rather than accepting that aristocrats were almost genetically conditioned to give, I argue that attention should be paid to how they processed their membership of the Church to their advantage. I suggest that their patronage before 476 can be overstated, or it may have taken the form of large payments for services such as burials and memorials; after that date the evidence suggests that they mostly patronised their

[233] T.F.X. Noble, 'Theoderic and the Papacy', in *Teodorico il Grande e I Goti d'Italia: atti del XIII Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Milan 2-6 novembre 1992,* Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo (1993), pp. 395-423; quoted by Sessa, 'The Roman Church and its Bishops', p. 426.

own localities or built on their own estates. I argue that members of the church actively attempted to exclude aristocrats' influence while still wanting their patronage. The Roman Synod of 502, which eschewed lay interference, was a strong message to aristocrats from a Church that was finding its feet in a new environment. The references to Vestina and Demetrias may well have been made in the spirit of encouraging donations.

Very little is known about clerical patronage after 476. The letters of Gregory I suggest that it may have continued, even if it did not impact on the Church as defined for the purpose of this chapter. There is good reason to think that the clergy's relationship with the Church changed, influenced by the new financial arrangement that may have made payment for clerical office worthwhile, and even normal. While any assessment can only be speculative, the financial and isomorphic benefits of copying the behaviours of the imperial bureaucracy may have been too appealing. Although his extant letters on the subject were directed to persons outside Rome, Gregory's campaign against simony comes across as a struggle for the soul of the administration.

I suggest that my analysis supports the hypothesis that the loss of the main category of patron was a profound shock to the Roman Church: the composition and contributions of patrons changed, the Church became more united and, arguably, its character changed to a degree. Popes emerged as the main patron and most of patronage then became internal. I consider that institutional theorists would recognise the loss as a shock. I suggest that they would also observe that the Church's post-476 strategic focus of its patronage on its pastoral and liturgical responsibilities had antecedents in behaviour since the pontificate of Sixtus III, thus exemplifying the concept of path dependence. They would probably also consider that the *quadripartitum* also demonstrated the concept: it addressed some of the same financial and patronal needs that had existed before 476, particularly maintenance of churches, clerical remuneration and funds for the poor. The financial arrangement may have contributed to the unification of the Church. How the pope acquired greater control over the *tituli* in the sixth century remains largely unexplained. In theory, particularly if the income of the patrimonies was included in the fund to be divided, the *quadripartitum* may have produced a more united body by giving the clergy a quarter share in the enterprise.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

The late fifth century brought about profound changes in the relationship between the Roman Church and Empire, and the start of a transformation in the Church itself. In responding to the changes, the Church devised new strategies to assert its authority. The creation of a chronicle of the bishops of the Roman Church, the *Liber Pontificalis*, allowed writers at the Church to craft a continuous history of popes developing the Roman Mass and all features of the Church in Rome, as well as to construct new expressions of claims to primacy on doctrinal matters. Later in the sixth century, the *Collectio Avellana* drew together a collection of letters that charted new formulations of authority, as well as explicitly and obliquely proposing the basis of a revised relationship with the imperial administration. In the later fifth and early sixth centuries, the bishops surpassed other patrons of the Roman Church in new constructions and refurbishments of the churches in the city. Through all these means the Church was transformed as an institution, reacting to major shocks, managing the self-interest of its members and following paths previously laid down. This study explores the development of the Roman Church as an institution. The findings in regard to this development exemplify some of the main insights of two schools of neo-institutional theory, Historical Institutionalism and Rational Choice Theory.

The study yields three main sets of findings, explored in the following three sections. First, in response to the two major challenges that the Church experienced at the beginning of the period, the loss of western emperors as its main patrons and supporters of its authority and the challenge from an eastern emperor to its claim to exclusively define orthodox doctrine, its members sought to promote the authority of their bishop, and to maintain and strengthen the Church's claim to doctrinal primacy. For much of the time, certainly the years 476-536, the Church's development should be understood as a response to these challenges. Second, the sources reviewed suggest that the Church is best understood as an ecclesiastical institution with ecclesiastical objectives and concerns, rather than one whose leadership was focused on secular aspirations in Rome. It was also an institution in which some members of the clergy sought to promote their own self-interest, while being alive to and seeking to promote the Church's strategic concerns. Third, the period saw new formulations of doctrinal and jurisdictional primacy which reflected the conditions of the time. I show that it is not correct to characterise assertions of papal authority as rhetoric to cover weakness: popes seriously engaged with eastern emperors and had some success. The Church's emphasis on its orthodoxy and doctrinal

primacy, and its relative effectiveness, call for a re-assessment of how papal authority was exercised or 'worked' in late antiquity.

The Roman Church's response to the Events of 476 and 482

Historical Institutionalists posit the notion of exogenous shocks. Institutions are usually in a state of equilibrium but they can sustain external shocks which puncture it and cause them to adjust. I consider that the two challenges that the Roman Church experienced in 476 and 482 were such exogenous shocks. I argue that much of the period, but especially 476-536, should be understood in terms of the Roman Church's response to the double challenges. To some historians the event of 476 initiated a new political landscape and created the conditions for an 'independent papacy' up until 536, during which popes more efficiently and assertively governed the church, after which the Church was subject to the Byzantine tyranny. However, the other side of that independence was insecurity, lack of support, and the need to establish authority and legitimacy in a changed environment. The significance of the challenges, and the appropriateness of their identification, can be seen in the way that the Roman Church's members reacted: the editors of the *Liber Pontificalis* actively promoted the authority of their bishop, and they sought to strengthen the Church's claim to doctrinal primacy.

I show in Chapter 2 that the first edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* was ultimately a response to these challenges: the editors united around the person of the bishop of Rome and sought to shore up and assert the claim to doctrinal primacy. They promoted the authority of the bishop by presenting holders of the office as initiators of all aspects of Church's development (organisation, liturgy and ritual, and church constructions) and by emphasising, in most cases, their martyrial status and/or their role in defending orthodoxy (making decisions on doctrinal issues or finding heretics). In presenting popes as constructors of churches, the editors claimed for them the same or a similar prestige that accrued to emperors or leading senators for the construction of public monuments in Rome. I additionally demonstrate that the first edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* contains five arguments or representations in support of the Church's claim to primacy on doctrine.

In Chapter 4 I show that the loss of the Church's main patrons was significant because other secular rulers did not replace western emperors in that role, and the resources available to popes and the Church after 476 were more limited. Neither of the Arian rulers, Odoacer (476-93) and Theoderic (493-526), are known to have patronised the Roman Church to any noticeable degree. Of the two, the position regarding Theoderic is less clear: some brick-stamps imply that he may have sponsored repairs at up to 14 churches but, equally, the bricks may have been acquired by others from a depot that he commissioned. Eastern emperors did not become significant patrons either before or after Justinian's reconquest, possibly as a matter of policy. The Byzantine administration constructed churches in Rome in the second half of the sixth

century, but these did not immediately become part of the Church of Rome and, arguably, were built to compete with it. With the exception of the pontificate of Symmachus, the number of churches that popes built was small, as was their relative size; some of the work carried out was restoration of cemeteries, which is unlikely to have entailed large expenditures.

The change brought about by the event of 476, which included the loss of western emperors' patronage was transformative; paradoxically, it may have helped to unify the Church. I argue in Chapter 4 that aristocrats did not take on the role of major patrons in Rome as they mainly directed their patronage towards their own localities and estates, a process that became more apparent in the last quarter of the fifth century. This was matched by the Roman Church's efforts to exclude the influence of aristocrats. The clergy became less visible as patrons, possibly due a financial arrangement that may have altered its members' relationship with the Church. The *quadripartitum*, a fourfold division of Church revenues, gave a quarter share to the clergy. It appears to have been introduced or acquired a new importance in c.475, probably in response to the run-down of the western imperial support. This measure gave the clergy a quarter share in the income of the Church and may have helped unite the organisation as well as changing the clergy's perception of themselves as recipients of an income rather than as donors. Whether or not this changed the character of their relationship with the Church, clerics ceased to be visible as patrons. In this process of elimination popes emerged as the main patrons.

The Roman Church lost much of the support structure that had existed before 476 and eastern emperors became challengers in certain areas. In 421 the emperor Honorius had opposed the attempt by his nephew Theodosius to allocate the papal vicariate of Thessalonica to Constantinople. In 445, in relation to Hilary of Arles's behaviour, the emperor Valentinian III issued a rescript requiring Gallic and other provinces to obey the apostolic see. After 476 the Church could no longer count on this type of support and it very quickly received a challenge to its claim to determine orthodox doctrine, when the emperor Zeno issued the *Henotikon*, the first of several such challenges in the period. This was not the first time that emperors had intervened to define doctrine: in 325 Constantine had influenced the definition of Christ's nature at Nicea; in 359 Constantius II had pressured two Councils into accepting a new creed. However, Zeno's intervention mattered much more in 482: it was issued after the Roman Church's success at Chalcedon (451), and at a time when it was beginning to assert its primacy on doctrine.

Instead of the apparatus of empire, a different structure of support was activated by the event of 476. I consider that the decision of the synod of Rome of 501 that the pope could not be judged was highly significant as it reflected the dynamics of a different structure in action. Insofar as the synod's membership was wider than that of the clergy of Rome and of the bishops of

suburbicarian Italy, and it was supported on a principled basis by Avitus of Vienne, it represented external ecclesiastical support for the office of the bishop of Rome. I argue that this external support for the office was later echoed by the efforts of the editors of *Liber Pontificalis* to promote his authority. Both actions point to the different nature of the environment in which the Church was operating after 476.

The analysis and argument that I present differs from those who see the Gothic Wars as more determinative in the development of the Church in this period, and from those who see the Laurentian schism of the Gothic Wars as the stimulus or context for *Liber Pontificalis.* Clearly, there was a considerable gap between 476/482 and the date of final compilation of the first edition (c.536) but the challenges, initiated at the start, continued to have effect throughout the period, and it would have taken time for the consequences of the events to become fully apparent. The Acacian schism (484-519) was followed by Justinian's attempt to secure acceptance of the theopaschite formula (campaigning 519-34). The Roman Church remained unsupported by the emperors or by their administration. The first edition of the *Liber* addressed needs that had been created in 476 and 482. This thesis argues for a greater understanding of the impact and significance of the two challenges initiated by the events of 476 and 482.

The Roman Church as an Institution

Although the sources are limited, this study shows that the Roman Church responded to the changed conditions after 476 by defining the boundaries of the institution and its relationships. It shows that the Church focused primarily on fulfilling the bishop's pastoral and liturgical responsibilities in the city. It casts some light on the leadership below the level of the pope which, in a way that resonates with the behaviour of the sixth-century imperial bureaucrat John Lydus, demonstrated both strategic awareness and the pursuit of self-interest. The study reveals the emergence of the clergy as a force, exemplifying the observations of Rational Choice theorists that people in institutions pursue their own interests. In addition, although the findings are to a degree speculative, the study hints at the existence of two major internal debates on the strategic direction of the institution in the sixth century. All these findings point to a greater degree of institutional development in the sixth century than has been appreciated to date. They also question certain conclusions of those who focus on explaining the rise of the Church and of its bishop in terms of a search for a position of dominance in Rome.

I argue that we see the Roman Church defining itself, with the help of Italian bishops, in its exclusion of aristocratic influence and in its attempts to re-define its relationships with secular rulers. I show in Chapter 4 that at a relatively early stage members of the Church sought to exclude the influence of aristocrats. Even though the membership of the synod of Rome that met in 502 was wider that the core Roman Church, the decision to prevent aristocrats making decisions about the Church was a defining moment. That exclusion and the declaration of the

principle *'papa a nemine iudicatur'* meant that the Church emerged from the synods of 501 and 502 with a clearer juridical and institutional identity. The prescriptions for Church-secular relations that are apparent in both the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana* were an acknowledgement of the fracture caused by the events of 476 and 482 and reflected an attempt to re-set the relationship.

In Chapter 4 my analysis of patronage demonstrates that popes' constructions, works and gifts were overwhelmingly directed at the major basilicas (St Peter's, St Paul's, and St Laurence's), major cemeterial basilicas and cemeteries, which in turn implies a determination to fulfil the bishop's pastoral and liturgical responsibilities in the city. As I have defined the Roman Church as the institution that functioned to fulfil the pope's pastoral and liturgical responsibilities, this may seem self-fulfilling. However, papal funding was not directed at public buildings or monuments, and the definition has served in practice to clarify the nature of aristocratic patronage. The recipients of papal largesse were the Church's main ecclesiastical centres which served as major cult sites, important burial grounds, and the locations for the city's stational liturgy that had started to take shape in the fifth century.

Chapter 4 also demonstrates that popes also introduced saint-cults and developed existing cults as a new form of patronage. These introductions and developments had elements in common with church construction, with which they were often linked in practice, but they represented a different patronal offering: the opportunity for access to saints and/or the hope of salvation, and a deeper religious experience generated by the enhanced setting in which relics were housed. These new offerings were both a new form of patronage and a new form of papal authority. The strategic direction of its patronage and the development of the new form of patronage and authority point to the essential ecclesiastical nature of the institution, one that focused primarily on fulfilling the pastoral and liturgical responsibilities of the bishop in the city.

Both the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana* offer insights into the higher reaches of the Roman Church at levels below that of the pope. Both are the work of bureaucrats who, like John Lydus, combined a strategic awareness of their institution's needs, an ability to balance those needs with their own self-interest, and a deep awareness of their institution's history. In Chapter 2 I show that the balance was struck by the editors who promoted the authority of the bishop of Rome and the record of orthodoxy and of doctrinal primacy on the one hand, and their own self-interest on the other by requiring that the bishop exercise his authority with their consent and by asserting that he was accountable.

The *Collectio* is an equally remarkable document. Contrary to current interpretations which seek to place it among canonical collections, I demonstrate that it is a very intricate letter collection, which had three main objectives: to defend the record of Pope Vigilius (537-55) or the position he stood for as reflected in his First *Constitutum*; to record and to assert new

formulations of primacy; and to opine on Church-Empire relations. The compiler's attention to the needs of the institution is apparent in his tracking of new expressions of primacy and in his suggestions for Church-Empire relations, the latter of which comprise the entire first section of the *Collectio.* A collective rather than a personal self-interest is detectable in so far as the *Collectio* may be considered to reflect the position of one side of a complex internal debate that may have persisted for 33 or more years after 554 on the condemnation of the Three Chapters and the related questions of whether the pope could absolve the sins of a deceased person, and whether saints were active post-mortem.

The study, in fact, suggests the presence of two important internal debates in the sixth century on the strategic direction of the Church, the evidence for which is slightly more secure in one of the cases. As regards the first, some evidence, stretching over a long period and alternatively explicitly or implicitly critical of payment for office, points to an intense debate within the institution over its character. Banned by the Church as simony, payment for office was a feature of the imperial bureaucracy and consecrations fees were a regular feature of ecclesiastical appointments in the East. Justinian gave the practice legitimacy when he legislated in 542 for consecration fees, including those for the bishop of Rome, and stated that they should be regarded as donations. There are a sufficient number of references to simony in the Roman Church in the *Liber*, the Laurentian Fragment, and in inscriptions across the sixth century to suggest that payment for office in the form of consecration fees, or in another form, was a feature of the papal administration. In Chapter 4 I argue that the references to payments and Gregory I's campaigns against simony probably reflect a tension between a tendency of the papal administration to emulate the practices of imperial bureaucracy, and a wish to comply with long-standing canons of the Church. Gregory's campaigns appear as a struggle for the soul of the episcopate in general and of the Roman Church in particular, and this, rather than or as much as his employment of monks in the administration, may have accounted for his evident unpopularity within Church after his death.

The most recent document in the *Collectio Avellana,* Pope Vigilius' First *Constitutum*, gives a hint of a second possible major internal debate, this time over the condemnation of the Three Chapters and the related question of whether popes could bind or loose the sins the deceased, and by extension whether saints could perform miracles post-mortem. Vigilius presented a principled defence of the Chapters, taking a position consistent with that of Gelasius I at the synod of Rome in 495, that is, it was not possible to condemn the deceased. The principle was honoured in the breech: by Pope Hormisdas in 519 when he required names of deceased eastern prelates to be removed from diptychs, and by Boniface II in 530 when he required the Roman clergy to condemn his deceased rival Dioscorus. Nevertheless, Vigilius argued the case on Gelasian lines in the First *Constitutum* and the issues were also debated in Constantinople at the

time. The Roman Church did not formally acknowledge the significance of Vigilius's subsequent condemnation of the Three Chapters in the Second *Constitutum* until Gregory I, as Pelagius II's deacon, wrote to the Istrian bishops in c.587. I argue in Chapter 3 that this points to the possibility that members of the Church divided on the issues and that the *Collectio Avellana* was compiled to provide a supporting dossier for one of the parties.

The study reveals a growing sense of a search for a special identity and legitimacy among the clergy, apparent in the *Liber's* editors' claim that Peter commissioned the papal administration. In Chapter 2 I show that in the Life of Clement, the editors altered extracted words from Clement's letter to James to construct a Petrine commission for the clerical administration. The altered words claimed that Peter passed on to Clement a divided mandate: Clement was to confine himself to preaching and leave the care of the business of the Church (*actus ecclesiasticus*) to others. Being able to demonstrate authority for their activities back to Peter would have given the clerical *ordo* in Rome their a new legitimacy.

Suggestions for Church-secular relations, which feature in both the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana,* belie the notion that either of these texts reflected an agenda for popes to become secular rulers in Rome. In Chapter 2 I identify three messages: emperors should have a subordinate role in regard to ecumenical councils; imperial patronage was welcomed, with Constantine presented as the exemplar; a ruler's engagement in disputed papal elections was acceptable if he applied the correct selection criteria. I establish in Chapter 3 that this aspect featured even more strongly, with the entire first section devoted to the issue. Apart from showing an emperor's exemplary handling of a disputed papal election, the compiler's selections argue strongly against emperors' involvement in doctrinal issues but assign to them roles in ensuring compliance with the Church's decisions and in dealing with heretics. These prescriptions suggest a view of the Church functioning in a society which was ruled over by an emperor or secular ruler. Although the messages are stronger in the *Collectio,* I suggest their presence in the *Liber* calls into question whether, in the first edition at least, the editors also had an agenda of promoting popes as future rulers of Rome.

Papal Authority and Primacy

Papal authority features strongly in this period due to the need to respond to the two challenges. Apart from the efforts of the editors of the *Liber Pontificalis* to promote the authority of the bishop in the Church of Rome, I show that both the *Liber* and the *Collectio* evinced new expressions of both doctrinal and jurisdictional primacy. For the most part these were unusual and they need to be understood in context. In Chapter 1 I proposed five components of papal authority which were observable before 476: biblical mandates, traditionally attributed authority (apostolic status and the bishop of Rome at the centre of the *communio)*, acquired authority (including the exercise of leadership), legislative and conciliar measures, and

isomorphic aspects (acquiring legitimacy by copying authoritative structures). With the departure of western emperors, the legislative component was effectively removed. I argue that what we see after 476 is an emphasis on the attributed and acquired components, and the tentative emergence of a new component, pastoral leadership. The isomorphic aspects remain but, in my view, they are not as significant in this period as some argue. The study shows that doctrinal primacy features more than jurisdictional claims, and it calls for a re-assessment of how papal authority was exercised in this period. Chapter 3 shows a new expression of jurisdictional primacy but its effectiveness was also ultimately based on rulers' wishes, albeit for their own reasons, to be in communion with Rome.

I show in Chapter 2 that the first edition of the *Liber* contains five arguments or representations in support of the Church's claim to primacy on doctrine. First, the editors asserted that a number of popes made decisions about the Church or the entire Church (*constituta de (omne) ecclesia*) which, I argue, referred to Christological issues. Second, the Church's record on orthodoxy was reflected in the martyrial status of popes (24 of the 33 popes before Constantine were claimed to have been martyred) or by their actions against heretics. These claims are to be understood in terms of the statement in the *libellus* that eastern prelates had to sign at the end of the Acacian schism: 'the apostolic see has always preserved the Catholic religion unstained'. Third, they asserted that Peter was the source of all four gospels and, by inference, his successors as bishop of Rome were the final arbiters of orthodox doctrine. Fourth, they asserted that and that with God's help he had defeated Simon Magus, the arch heresiarch. In the understanding of the time, heresy was genealogical and all Christian heresy was traceable to Simon; by inference all orthodoxy was sourced from Peter. The fifth assertion of this primacy in the *Liber* is encapsulated in the multiple use of the term *sedes apostolica* in the narrative of the Acacian schism. In describing the Roman Church as the *sedes apostolica* in the account of the schism, which itself was about Rome's doctrinal primacy, the editors strongly asserted Rome's primacy.

The leadership element of doctrinal primacy is emphasised in the *Collectio Avellana*. The *Collectio* differs in that its documents show how the Church actually pressed its claims, but it also has aspects of construction and argument. The *Collectio* makes clear that the Church made its claim by referring to Pope Leo I's leadership and success at Chalcedon. This was conditioned by the fact that in opposing Zeno on the *Henotikon* and Justinian on the theopaschite formula and the Three Chapters, the Church was defending the Chalcedon decision, for which Leo could claim a major responsibility. After the Council, the Church sought to defend and consolidate this success: defence of Chalcedon and promotion of doctrinal primacy based on Leo's leadership became inextricably linked. The compilers show two other examples of popes demonstrating leadership on a doctrinal issue. First, they included a series of

letters which purportedly show Felix III (483-92) leading Italian and eastern bishops in doctrinal issue that only affected eastern churches, the miaphysite bishop of Antioch Peter the Fuller's interpolation in the *Trisagion*. Second, the collection contains two letters of Gelasius I refuting the teaching of Pelagius, entirely by reference to scriptural authority; two additional related letters indicate that the compiler wished the reader to understand that, in writing to the bishops of Dardania on Pelagianism, Gelasius was fulfilling the bishop of Rome's responsibility (**'**managing the care of the entire sheepfold of the Lord without cease'**)** to drive out heresies.[1] I argue that Gelasius' letters were included to provide an example of a pope demonstrating leadership and competence in theology, abilities that may have been considered pre-requisites in bishops claiming to be the arbiters of orthodox doctrine.

Both the *Liber* and the *Collectio* contain new expressions of jurisdictional primacy. The *Liber's* is pure construction. The editors inserted into the Lives of Peter and Clement altered wording from the apocryphal letter of Clement to James, an important document in the development of ideas of Petrine succession which had translated into Latin by Rufinus in the early fifth century. In borrowing from the letter, the editors made some significant changes: in the life of Peter the power of binding and loosing was equated with the government of the Church (*gubernandi* appears in apposition to *potestas ligandi solvendique*):[2] in the life of Clement, the *cathedra* entrusted by Christ to Peter became the *ecclesia* which was passed from Peter to Clement.

The selection of letters in the *Collectio* charts the development of a new expression of jurisdictional primacy that emerged in the Acacian schism, the right of the bishop of Rome to determine membership of the entire Christian community. During the schism popes found themselves having to justify the excommunication of Acacius, a process which led to consideration of the 'power to bind and loose' and to a considerable discourse on the Christian *communio*. Pope Gelasius concluded that power could not be exercised on deceased persons; after Acacius died in 489, he explained that he could not rehabilitate the archbishop as God had reserved to himself the power to absolve the deceased. Development of the interpretation can be seen in the reports of the Roman synods of 485 and 495, at which the invocations change from Matthew 16:18 ('You are Peter, and on this rock …') to Matthew 16:19 ('whatsoever you bind on earth, will be bound in heaven …'). I show in Chapter 3 that this mutated into the power of the pope to determine membership of the community. I argue that this was a refreshing of the notion, identified by Hertling, of the pope as the centre of the *communio*, but with the added force of the power to bind and loose grafted on.

The period also sees the beginning of a newly developed expression of papal authority, the bishop as intercessor between Christ and his saints on the one hand, and congregations in Rome

[1] *CA* 98.1.
[2] *LP* 1.5.

on the other. As I show in Chapter 4, this is apparent in the introduction of new saint-cults and the development of a few existing ones. It owed much to an increased belief in the efficacy of relics from the late fifth century onwards. In almost all examples the presence of relics is attested by *confessiones*. We are heavily dependent on a few inscriptions and the mosaics at the SS. Cosmae et Damianis and St Laurence's for the interpretation of this phenomenon. In the mosaics the bishop is seen in the company of Christ and his saints, acting as a bridge, and offering opportunities for seeking healing, salvation or whatever else the suppliant wanted. These introductions and development of existing cults were accompanied by visual and material embellishments which enhanced the experience for the faithful. They provided popes with a new means to engage with and to exercise authority over congregations in Rome.

The sources examined reveal some components of isomorphic authority but they are not, in my view, a dominant feature. I show that isomorphic elements appear in three areas: church constructions, the introduction of new saint-cults, and in the *Liber's* authors' assertions about popes' decrees. Construction of public buildings in Rome invariably carried some imperial associations but, in Chapter 4, I argue that this can be overstated in the period after 476 when, excepting the reign of Symmachus, constructions were fewer and smaller. The introduction of new cults evoked similar patronal associations to constructions, with which they were often intimately connected, but they also had a novel feature, which did not evoke comparisons with the imperial past: the attempt by popes to interpose themselves as intercessors. I also consider that the editors of the *Liber* sought to imply that popes' decisions, introduced by *constituit (ut)* or *fecit.constitutum* carried the same weight as imperial *constitutiones*. These examples are more modest that than those of some historians, particularly Sessa (who proposes the Roman household steward as an archetype of papal authority) and McKitterick (who argues the *Liber's* adoption of the structure of imperial histories was part of a project to promote popes as secular rulers in Rome).

The stress on doctrinal primacy and the nature of the new expression of jurisdiction primacy in the *Collectio* suggest that a re-appraisal of how papal authority was exercised or 'worked' in late antiquity is appropriate. In the historiography for this period there is a heavy emphasis on jurisdictional primacy, the continuing legacy of the work of Walter Ullmann. In this study I argue that that the key to understanding papal authority and primacy in this period is to appreciate the importance of the desire of other churches and communities and of emperors to be in communion with Rome. This predisposition had developed over time and a state of being in communion with Rome had become a requirement for membership of the wider Christian community. Central to this development had been the sense that Rome was consistently orthodox and that it occupied a special, if somewhat undefined, place in the ecclesiastical structure. This desire among orthodox supporters of Chalcedon was not fundamentally changed

by the deposition of western emperors but, I suggest, that it came to the fore after 476 when the pope's authority was no longer supported by the apparatus of imperial government and the Acacian schism opened up the issues of excommunication and the Christian communion, and the Church faced a challenge from eastern emperors on doctrine. The assertions of doctrinal primacy in the *Liber* and the *Collectio* reflect efforts of members of the Church to protect and strengthen its position in the face of challenges from eastern emperors. The new expression of jurisdictional primacy is similarly sourced: as Hertling has argued, the sense that the pope is the centre of the *communio* was also based on Rome's orthodoxy. I show that by 519 (when the Acacian schism was settled) the position had the added force of Matthew 16:19. The Church may not have had the means to enforce its jurisdiction but in the desire of churches and rulers to be in communion with it, it had considerable soft power and both texts reflected attempts to maintain it.

The view of papal authority that I present does not fit with George Demacopoulos's argument that popes' assertion of authority amounted to rhetoric at times of weakness. His thesis has gained traction in recent years. I do not agree with his assessment of a number of situations and events. He considers that Gelasius's rehabilitation of Misenus at the synod of Rome in 495 was an act of weakness. In Chapter 3 I argue that the report of the synod was a powerful message to eastern churchmen during the Acacian schism that they reconcile with the Church of Rome while they were still alive and still could do so. He makes no mention of Hormisdas's success in excluding names from diptychs which I discuss in the same chapter. On the Church's greatest failure in the period, Vigilius's condemnation of the Three Chapters, he points to Gregory I's letters to Queen Theodelinda in 593 and later, which make no mention of the Council of Constantinople and refer to Peter and his confession, as an example of his thesis. Instead, I reference Gregory's earlier letter to the bishops of Istria and his argument that popes could legitimately change their minds, and this followed, as far as we know, thirty or more years of relative silence on the subject. This study shows, in Chapter 3 in particular, that popes engaged with emperors and other opponents on a realistic basis, and had some success.

In summary, my focus on the Roman Church as an institution has resulted in different conclusions to those historians who seek to explain the emergence of the bishop of Rome as the ruler in Rome. Since historians pivoted away from the teleology inherent in many of the histories of the papacy to explain the position of the Bishop and the Church in the city of Rome, there has been considerably less interest in Roman Church as an institution. Thomas Noble has pointed to the relative unattractiveness of the subject. Explaining the Church *in* Rome is a different research subject and involves different research questions, but both subjects (the Papacy and the Church in Rome) examine the same sources and, I consider, there should be a reasonable congruence in the findings. To put it another way, an institution's functions and

objectives should match or be consistent with how the institution interacts with its environment. I show an institution or organisation that was focused on pastoral and liturgical responsibilities in Rome. It was also one that focused on maintaining its position in the wider Church, hence the emphasis on maintaining its record for orthodoxy and upholding its claims to be the ultimate arbiter of orthodoxy. My analysis shows no evidence of an agenda for independence, other than freedom from interference in doctrinal issues, and no aspiration for secular rule.

The study calls for a re-appraisal of the understanding as to how popes were able to exercise authority in late antiquity. I suggest the questions should be not why was there a gap between papal rhetoric and achievement but, rather, why was the Roman Church as successful as it was, and how was it able to survive the reputational damage of the Three Chapters controversy, given that leadership on doctrine was central to its identity. The Roman Church may have lost much of the supportive structure of Empire, but other elements or components came into play, in particular the desire of orthodox churches, communities and emperors to be in communion with Rome. The principle of papal non-justiciability that emerged at the synod of Rome in 501 points to the existence of other parties who had an interest in the bishop of Rome exercising a role and some power. To date papal authority in this period has been perceived primarily in jurisdictional terms. This study shows that the story of the sixth century was the challenge to Rome's primacy on doctrine and how the Church as an institution managed and processed that challenge.

Appendix (Tables)

Tables

Table 2.1 Hallmarks of Authority

Pope	Expression of action by the pope	Discipline	Liturgy	Organisation	Construction	Decree *De (Omne) Ecclesia*	*LP* Reference
Peter							
Linus	constituit ut	1					2.2
Cletus	none						
Clement	fecit, dividit			1			4.2
Anaclitus	construxit (memoriam)				1		5.2
Evaristus	dividit, ordinavit			2			6.2
Alexander	constituit		1				7.2
Sixtus	constituit ut (2)[1]	1	1				8.2
Telesphorus	constituit ut, fecit ut	1	1				9.2
Hyginus	composuit, distribuit,			2			10.2
Pius	constituit, fecit constitutum	1				1	11.3
Anicetus	constituit ut	1					12.2
Soter	constituit ut	1					13.2
Eleuther	firmavit	1					14.2
Victor	constituit ut (2), fecit	1	1	1			15.2-3
Zephyrinus	constituit (3), fecit constitutum	1	2			1	16.2
Callistus	constituit, fecit (2)	1			2		17.2-3
Urban	fecit, posuit		1				18.2
Pontian	none						19
Anteros	exquisivit			1			20.2
Fabian	dividit, fecit, praecepit			2	1		21.2

Cornelius	none						22
Lucius	praecepit ut			1			23.3
Stephen I	constituit	1					24.2
Sixtus II	none						25
Dionysius	dedit, constituit			2			26.2
Felix I	constituit, fecit		1		1		27.2
Eutychian	constituit ut (2)		2				28.3
Gaius	constituit ut, dividit			2			29.2-3
Marcellinus	none						30
Marcellus	fecit, constituit			1	1		31.2
Eusebius	none						32.2
Miltiades	constituit, fecit ut	1	1				33.2
Silvester	constituit ut (5), fecit, fecit constitutum	2	2	1	1	1 (omne)	34.3-8
Marcus	constituit ut (2), constitutum ordinavit, fecit (3)		1	1	3	1 (omne)	35.2-3
Julius	fecit (5), constitutum fecit (2)	1		1	5		36.2-3
Liberius	ornavit, fecit				2		37.7
Felix II	fecit				1		38.2
Damasus	fecit (2), constituit ut, constitutum fecit, construxit		1		3	1	39.2-4
Siricius	constitutum fecit, constituit ut (2), constituit	2	1			1(omne)	40.1-3
Anastasius I	fecit constitutum, constituit ut (2)	1	1		1	1	41.1-2
Innocent I	constitutum fecit (2), constituit ut	1				2(omnem)	42.1-3, 7.

Zosimus	fecit constitutum (2), precepit ut, constituit	1	2				43.1
Boniface I	constituit ut (2)	1	1				44.5-6
Caelestinus	constituta fecit, constituit ut		1			1(omnem)	45.1
Sixtus III	fecit (2)				2		46.3,4,6,7
Leo I	constituit (2), constituit ut (2)		1	1	2		47.6-8
Hilarus	fecit constitutum, fecit (5)				5	1	48.1,2,12
Simplicius	constituit ut, dedicavit (4)		1		4 (dedications)		49.1-2
Felix III	fecit				1		50.1
Gelasius	fecit constitutum, dedicavit, fecit (2)				2 (1 dedication)	1(omnem)	51.2,5
Anastasius II	fecit				1		52.1
Symmachus	fecit (5), constituit ut, construxit (2)		1		7		53.6-11
Hormisdas	fecit				1		54.1
John I	none						55.7
Felix IV	fecit/ refecit				2		56.2
Boniface II	none						57
John II	none						58

[1] The number indicates the frequency of the expression.

Table 2.2 Major Disputes and Christological Issues

***LP* Reference**	**Pope**	***Constitutum de (omne) ecclesia***	**Possible content of the decree *de (omne) ecclesia***	**Other *Liber Pontificalis* entries**	**Date of Easter (Historical Record)[1]**	**Readmittance of apostates (*lapsi*) (Historical Record) [2]**	**Re-baptism (Historical Record)[3]**
LP 1	Peter (-64/67)						
LP 9	Telesphorus (c.125-c.136)			*LP* 9.2: a fast of 7 weeks to be observed before Easter.			
LP 11	Pius (c.142-c.155)	*De ecclesia*	Action against Marcion	*LP* 11.2: Easter to be celebrated on a Sunday.			
LP 12	Anicetus (c.155-c.174)			No reference to the issue of Easter in the *LP*.	Polycarp of Smyrna visited Rome when Anicetus was pope to argue the date of Easter. He pressed for the 14th day in Jewish month of Nisan.[4]		
LP 14	Eleutherius (c.174-89)			*LP* 15.2: Easter to be celebrated on the Lord's day.			
LP 15	Victor (189-98)			*LP* 15.2-3: Victor decreed like Eleutherius that Easter to be celebrated on a Sunday. Also, Easter should be kept on the Lord's day	Victor tried to get all churches to follow Roman practice on Easter. Majority followed but not Asia Minor.[5]		

				between 14th and 21st of the first lunar month.			
LP 16	Zephyrinus (198-217)	*De ecclesia*	Handling of Adoptionism.				
LP 22	Cornelius (251-53)					Cornelius favoured inclusion of *lapsi* after public penance.[6]	
LP 23	Lucius (253-54)			No reference to the issues of *lapsi* and baptism in the *LP*.		Lucius maintained Cornelius's policy of restoring apostates after suitable penance.[7]	Lucius received a letter from Dionysius of Alexandria on the validity of heretical baptism.
LP 24	Stephen I (254-57)			No reference to the issue of baptism in the *LP*.			Stephen kept to the Roman practice of accepting heretical baptism.[8]
LP 25	Sixtus II (257-58)			No reference to the issue of baptism in the *LP*.			Sixtus upheld the Roman position on re-baptism.[9]
LP 26	Dionysius (260-68)			No reference to the issue of re-baptism in the *LP*.			Dionysius followed Stephen and Sixtus II on re-baptism.
LP 34	Silvester (314-35)	*De omne ecclesia*	The condemnation of Arius, Callistus, Photinus and Sabellius.				
LP 35	Marcus (336)	*De omne ecclesia*	Not known.				

LP 39	Damasus (366-84)	*De ecclesia*	Suppression of Apollinarianism.				
LP 40	Siricius (384-99)	*De omne ecclesia*	Excommunication of Jovinian or condemnation of Bonosus.				
LP 41	Anastasius I (399-401)	*De ecclesia*	Synod condemning Origen's teaching.				
LP 42	Innocent I (401-17)	*De omne ecclesia*	Action against Pelagius.				
LP 45	Celestine (422-32)	*De omne ecclesia*	Action against Nestorius.				
LP 47	Leo I (440-61)	*De ecclesia (Felician epitome)*[10]	Leo's Tome which was accepted at Chalcedon?				
LP 48	Hilarus (461-68)	*De ecclesia*	Confirmation of Nicea, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Leo I's Tome.				
LP 50	Felix III (483-92)	*De ecclesia* (issued by clergy)	Not known.				
LP 51	Gelasius (492-96)	*De omne ecclesia*	Letter to the bishops of Lucania, Bruttium and Sicily?				

[1] The Quartodeciman Controversy
[2] The issue surfaced after the Decian-Valerian persecutions (250-60).
[3] The issue surfaced after the Decian-Valerian persecutions (250-60).
[4] Eno, *The Rise of the Papacy*, p. 40.
[5] Eno, *The Rise of the Papacy*, pp. 40-41.
[6] Siecienski, *The Papacy and the Orthodox*, p. 151.

[7] Kelly and Walsh, *Dictionary of Popes*, p. 16.
[8] Kelly and Walsh, *Dictionary of Popes*, pp. 16-17.
[9] Kelly and Walsh, *Dictionary of Popes*, p. 17.
[10] Leo I's decree *de ecclesia* is only mentioned in the Felician epitome.

Table 2.3 The *Liber Pontificalis's* Attribution to Popes of Martyrdom and of Action against Heresy

Pope	Persecutions	Editorial Phase in which martyrdom stated	Finding Heretics / Dealing with heresy (Editorial Phase)	*Depositio Martyrum*	*Depositio Episcoporum*	Canon of the Mass	Evidence of early or sixth century tradition of Martyrdom?
Peter (-64/67)		P1		Yes		Yes	Yes
Linus (c.66-c78)		P1				Yes	Yes
Cletus (c.79-91)		P1				Yes	Yes
Clement (c.91-101)		P1				Yes	Yes
Anacletus (Cletus)		P1					No[1]
Evaristus (c.100-09)		P1					No[2]
Alexander (c.109-c116)		P1					No[3]
Sixtus (c.116-c.125)		P1					No[4]
Telesphorus (c.125-c.136)		P1					Yes
Hyginus (c.138-c.142)							
Pius (c.142-c.155)							
Anicetus (c.155-c.166)		P3					No[5]
Soter (c.166-c.174)							
Eleutherius (c.174-89)							
Victor (189-98)		P1					No[6]
Zephyrinus (198-217)							
Callistus (217-22)		P1		Yes			Yes
Urban (222-30)		confessor P2					No[7]

Pontian (230-35)		P1					Probable[8]
Anteros (235-36)		P1					No[9]
Fabian (236-50)	Decius (250-51)	P1		Yes			Yes
Cornelius (251-53)	Gallus (251-53)	P2				Yes	Yes
Lucius (253-54)	Gallus (251-53)	P2			Yes		No[10]
Stephen I (254-57)	Valerian (253-60)	P1			Yes		No[11]
Sixtus II (257-58)	Valerian (253-60)	P1		Yes		Yes	Yes
Dionysius (260-68)					Yes		
Felix I (269-74)		P1			Yes		No[12]
Eutychian (275-83)		P3			Yes		No[13]
Gaius (283-96)		P3 (confessor in P2)			Yes		No[14]
Marcellinus (296-304)	Diocletian (303)	P2			Yes		No[15]
Marcellus (306-08)							No[16]
Eusebius (310)			'*hereticos invenit*' (P1).		Yes		yes?
Miltiades (311-14)			'*Manichei inventi sunt*' (P1)				
Silvester (314-35)							
Marcus (336)					Yes		
Julius (337-52)					Yes		
Liberius (352-66)							
Felix II (355-65)		P2					No[17]
Damasus (366-84)							
Siricius (384-99)			'*invenit Manicheos*' (P1)				
Anastasius I (399-401)							

Innocent I (401-17)			‘*Catafrigas invenit; invenit Pelagium et Caelestium hereticos'* (P1)				
Zosimus (417-18)							
Boniface I (418-22)							
Celestine (422-32)							
Sixtus III (432-40)							
Leo I (440-61)			‘*invenit duas hereses, Eutychiana et Nestoriana'* (P1)				
Hilarus (461-68)							
Simplicius (468-83)							
Felix III (483-92)							
Gelasius (492-96)			‘*inventi sunt Manichei'* (P1)				
Anastasius II (496-98)							
Symmachus (498-514)			‘*invenit Manicheos'* (P1)				
Hormisdas (514-23)			‘*invenit Manicheos'* (P1)				
John I (523-26)		P2					Yes
Felix IV 526-30)							
Boniface II (530-32							
John II (533-35)							

[1] Irenaeus only mentions Telephorus as a martyr in this period.
[2] As note 1.
[3] As note 1.
[4] As note 1.
[5] Kelly and Walsh, *Dictionary of Popes*, p. 7: The tradition that he died a martyr lacks confirmation.
[6] Kelly and Walsh, *Dictionary of Popes*, p. 9: Reports that he was a martyr are routine and should be rejected.
[7] Urban's pontificate was wholly in reign of Alexander Severus which was free of persecution.
[8] Kelly and Walsh, *Dictionary of Popes*, p. 12: Pontian died after enduring harsh conditions in Sardinia.
[9] The Liberian Catalogue, *Le* Liber Pontificalis, p. 4, states that he 'fell asleep'.
[10] Included in the *Depositio Episcoporum*, not in the *Depositio Martyrum*.
[11] As note 10.
[12] As note 10.
[13] As note 10.
[14] As note 10.
[15] As note 10.
[16] The fifth-century Martyrology of Jerome reports that he died a confessor.
[17] *LP* 37.5.

Table 4.1 Patronage of Constructions (312-c.600)

Churches, Other Buildings	Date	Type of Church / Other Information	Main Patrons	Endowments?	Sources / Evidence
A. Period 312-476					
Tituli Byzantis, Clementis (1), S. Anastasiae, Chrysogoni (1) , Sabinae (1), Gaii, Crescentianae, Pudentis (1), Callisti, Caeciliae, Marcelli (1).	pre-312	Later *tituli* which may have had a previous existence as *domus ecclesiae.*			Note.[1]
First Sub-period (312-66)					
Basilica Constantiniana	312-37	Church at 'the Lateran'.	Emperor Constantine	14,624 *solidi.*	*LP* 34.9-15.
St Peter's	c.325-c.342	Started by Constantine, completed by Constans.	Emperors Constantine and Constans	3,708 *solidi.*	*LP* 34. 16-20 *ICUR-NS*, II, nos. 4092, 4093.
St Paul's (1)	312-37	Small basilica, no more than 24m long and 18m wide.[2]	Emperor Constantine	4,070 *solidi* (questionable).[3]	*LP* 34.21.
Basilica in palatio sessoriano	312-37	Built on the Sessorian barracks.	Emperor Constantine	1101 *solidi*.	*LP* 34.22.
St Laurence's (1)	324-37	'Basilica maior'. An ambulatory basilica.	Emperor Constantine	865 *solidi*.	*LP*: 34.24
Basilica S. Agnae	324-37	The *LP* attributes it to Constantine. Basilica and baptistry. Also attached the mausoleum of Constantina.	Constantine and the imperial family	695 *solidi.*	*LP* 34.23; *CBCR*, I, p. 16.

Basilica SS. Petri et Marcellini	312-24	Circiform funerary basilica, built on imperial villa or military camp. Also attached the mausoleum of the empress Helena.	Emperor Constantine	3,754 *solidi*.	*LP*: 34: 26.
Basilica on Via Ardeatina	312-37	Circiform funerary basilica	Constantine		Note.[4]
S. Sebastiani (Basilica Apostolorum)	before 349?	Circiform funerary basilica built before 349; *ad corpus* (St Sebastian).	Constantine or a successor		*CBCR*, IV, pp. 98-112
Titulus Silvestri (1)	314-35	Church built on the estate of the priest Equitius. Also known as *titulus* Equitii.	Pope Silvester and the priest Equitius	413 and/or 476 *solidi*.	*LP*: 34.3 and 34.33.
Titulus Marci	336	Near Pallacinae in Rome.	Pope Marcus		*LP* 35.3.
Basilica on the Via Ardeatina	336	In Cemetery of Balbina	Pope Marcus	125 *solidi.*	*LP*: 35.3 and 35.5.
Basilica Julii	337-52	Basilica near (*iuxta*) the forum of Trajan; it had no dedicated clergy.	Pope Julius		Liberian Catalogue;[5] *LP* 36.2.
Titulus Callisti?	337-52	Across the Tiber, next to Callistus's foundation.	Pope Julius		Liberian Catalogue; *LP* 36.2.
Basilica in Via Portuensis	337-52	The Liberian Catalogue suggests a basilica, the *LP* a cemetery.	Pope Julius		Liberian Catalogue; *LP* 36.2.
Basilica in Via Aurelia	337-52	The Liberian Catalogue suggests a basilica, the *LP* a cemetery.	Pope Julius		Liberian Catalogue; *LP* 36.2.
Basilica Valentini in Via Flamminia	337-52	The Liberian Catalogue suggests a basilica, the *LP* a cemetery.	Pope Julius		Liberian Catalogue; *LP* 36.2.
Basilica Liberii	352-66	Said by the *LP* to have been have been near the market of Livia, its location has not been identified.	Pope Liberius		*LP*: 37.7.
Second Sub-period (366-432)					
Titulus Damasi	366-84	Founded or extensively rebuilt by Damasus. Dedicated to St Laurence 'in Damaso'.	Pope Damasus	405 *solidi.*	*LP*: 39.4; *ICUR*, II.1, p.134, no.5
Basilica in Via Ardeatina	366-84	Site of Damasus's and his mother and sister's burial.	Pope Damasus		*LP*: 39.6.

Titulus S. Anastasiae	366-84?	Structural changes in 2nd half of the 4th century. A fifth-century inscription suggests Damasus was responsible for the ceiling, and consequently the building?	Pope Damasus?		*CBCR* I, pp. 43-46; *ICUR*, II.1, pp. 24, no. 25 and p. 150, no. 18.
Titulus Fasciolae	366-84	*Titulus* known from an inscription dateable to 377.	Pope Damasus?[6]		*ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4815.
St Paul's (2)	386-404	'Basilica of the Three Emperors', built on a scale to match St Peters.	Emperors Theodosius I, Valentinian II and Honorius		*ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4780.
Titulus Pudentis (2) (S. Pudentianae)	387 or 390-401/417	The transformation of the *thermae* hall into Christian hall and lavish decoration.	Presbyters Ilicius, Maximus and Leopardus		*CBCR*, III, p. 279. Note.[7]
Titulus Marcelli (2)	380-450	May have been completed at turn of 5th century. Possible replacement of *domus ecclesiae* by a standard basilica?	No known suggestions		*CBCR*, II, p. 214-15.
Titulus S. Clementis (2)	end of 4th century	Inscribed into an existing building. Dedicated by Pope Siricius (384-99)?	'The collective commission of a Christian community'.[8]		*CBCR*, I, pp. 119-22, 135-36.
Titulus Crescentianae (S. Sixti)	399-402	Excavations reveal an early Christian building c.400.	Pope Anastasius		*LP*: 41.2; Brandenburg, pp. 152-53.
Titulus Tigridae (S. Balbinae?)	c.390s?	The first documentary evidence is 595. Masonry and construction details suggest c. 400.	Not known.		*CBCR*, I (S. Balbina), pp. 93-94.
St Peter's	400-08	Mausoleum at St Peter's for Honorian dynasty.	Emperor Honorius		
S. Petri in vinculis (1)	c.400	Construction of a church that collapsed and/or was rebuilt	Not known.		*CBCR*, III, pp. 178-89, 227-31.
Titulus Vestinae	401-17	Project managed by the priests Ursicinus, Leopardus, and the deacon Livianus?	Vestina (aristocrat) and Pope Innocent I?	1,016 solidi.	*LP* 42.3.

Titulus Pammachii (and Titulus Byzantis?) (SS. Iohannis et Pauli)	c.410	A possible combination of 2 *tituli*.	Pammachius and Byzans (both aristocrats)?		*CBCR*, I, pp. 268-69, 299-300; *ICUR*, II.1, p. 150.
S. Felicitatis in Via Salaria	418-22	Oratory built in cemetery where Boniface I stayed during the disputed election (418-19) and where he was buried.	Boniface I		*LP* 44.2,6 and 7.
Titulus Sabinae (2)	425-32	A sumptuous replacement of a *domus*. The land may have been provided by the aristocratic Caeionii family.[9]	Bishop Peter of Illyria		*LP* 46.8; *ILCV*, no. 1778a.
Third Sub-period (432-476)					
S. Mariae	432-40	An integral building of 5th century, constructed *de novo*.	Pope Sixtus III but it may have been started under Innocent I, Boniface I, or Celestine.	773 solidi.	*LP* 46.3.
Titulus Lucinae		Probably the church for which Sixtus III asked the emperor Valentinian III's permission.	Pope Sixtus III?		*LP* 46.6; *CBCR*, II, p. 161.
S. Petri in Vinculi (2) (*Titulus* Eudoxiae)	432-40	The church replaced another built some 30 years earlier.	Presbyter Philip, with some support from the Empress Eudoxia.		*ICUR*, II.1, p.110, nos. 66 and 67
Monasterium ad Catacumbas in Via Appia	432-40	A basilical monastery servicing S. Sebastiani?	Sixtus III		*LP* 46.7.
S. Stephani in Via Latina	440-61	Pope Leo initiated construction with funds from Demetrias, and with priest Tigrinus as supervisor.	Demetrias (aristocrat)		*LP* 47.1; *CBCR*, IV, pp. 250-60; *ILCV*, I, 1765.
Basilica Cornelii in Via Appia	440-61	Built by Leo I and dedicated to a predecessor, Pope Cornelius (251-53).	Pope Leo I		*LP* 47.6.

Monasterium SS. Iohannis et Pauli	440-61	Basilical monastery serving St Peter's; also called '*Maior*'.	Pope Leo I		*LP* 47.7.
Titulus Chrysogoni (2)	mid-fifth century?	Probably the transformation of an original 4th-century *domus.*	Not known		*CBCR*, I, pp. 144-46, 160-64.
Titulus Aemilianae (SS. Quattuor Coronatorum)	fifth century?	Probable transformation of a fourth-century apsidal hall of private *domus* into a fifth-century church?	Unknown		Archaeological evidence currently inaccessible.
Titulus Gaii (S. Susannae)	fifth century?	No evidence of construction in the 4th to 6th centuries.	Not known		Synodal subscriptions (499 and 595).
Titulus Praxedis	fifth century or earlier	Nothing known about the fifth- or earlier century building.	Not known		Synodal subscriptions (499 and 595).
Titulus Eusebii (S. Eusebii)	5th century?	First known mention 474, then 499 and 595.	Not known		Brandenburg, pp. 214-15; Synodal subscriptions (499 and 595).
S. Archangeli Michaelis	unknown	Mentioned in Pope Symmachus's life.	Unknown		*LP* 53.9.
St Laurence's	461-68	A basilical monastery, 2 baths, a *praetorium*, two libraries.	Pope Hilarus		*LP* 48.12.
Baptisterium Basilicae Constantinanae	461-68	Three Oratories: S. Iohannis Baptistae, S. Iohannis Evangelistae, Sanctae Crucis.	Pope Hilarus		*LP* 48.2.
Baptisterium Basilicae Constantinanae	461-68	Oratory dedicated to St Stephen	Pope Hilarus		*LP* 48.12.
Monasterium ad Lunam	461-68	Nothing known of its history or location	Pope Hilarus		*LP* 48.12.
Basilica Salvatoris	462-70	Arian Church. Later (590-604) converted to S. Agathae Gothorum.	The *magister militum* Ricimer		*ILCV*, 1637; *ICUR*, II, 438.

S. Andreae	470-79	Transformation of *aula* of Junius Bassus. Dedicated by Simplicius.	Catholic Goth general Valila		*LP* 49.1; *ICUR*, II.1, p. 436.
S. Stephani in celio monte	460-83	A martyrium without relics or resident clergy. Begun in 460s, dedicated by Pope Simplicius (468-83).	Emperors but unclear which one(s).		*LP* 49.1.
S. Bibianae	468-83?	Basilica *ad corpus*. Probably a conversion of a hypogeum in a house. Dedicated by Simplicius.	Aristocratic?		*LP* 49.1; *CBCR*, I, p. 94.
S. Stephani (near St Laurence's)	468-83?	Dedicated by Simplicius.	Aristocratic foundation.		*LP* 49.1.
B. Period 476-c.600					
S. Agapiti.	483-92	Close to St Laurence's.	Pope Felix III.		*LP* 50.1.
S. Euphemiae; SS Nicandri, Eleutheri et Andreae; S. Mariae (3 Basilicas)	492-96	Located respectively at Tivoli, the via Labicana (Villa Pertusa), and Via Laurentina (20 miles from Rome). Dedicated by Pope Gelasius.	Unknown aristocrats.		*LP* 51.5.
S. Petri (in Via Trebana)	498-514	27 miles from Rome. Dedicated by Pope Symmachus.	The illustrious praetorian prefect Albinus and Glaphyra.		*LP* 53.10.
St Peter's	498-514	Basilica S. Andreae.	Pope Symmachus		*LP* 53.6; *ICUR-NS*, II, nos. 4106, 4109, 4110.
S. Andreae (at St Peter's)	498-514	Oratories S. Iohannis Baptistae, S. Iohannis Evangelistae and S. Crucis.	Pope Symmachus		*LP* 53. 6-7.
SS. Cosmae et Damianis	498-514	Oratory at or near S. Mariae.	Pope Symmachus		*LP* 53.9.
Titulus SS. Silvestri et Martini (2)	498-514	Construction of a church dedicated to St Martin which incorporates the *titulus* Silvestri/Equitii.	Pope Symmachus or the *vir illustris* Palatinus.		*LP* 53.8; Laurentian Fragment 52.15.

St Peter's, St Paul's, St Laurence's	498-514	Accommodation for the poor (*pauperibus habitacula*)	Pope Symmachus		*LP* 53.10.
S Pancratii	498-514	Basilica and bath.	Pope Symmachus		*LP* 53.8; Laurentian Fragment 52.15.
S. Agathae	498-514	Basilica on Via Aurelia, 10 miles outside Rome.	Pope Symmachus		*LP* 53.8.
Basilica in the territory of Albanum	514-23	Only known from the *LP*. Probably in modern Albano Laziale, some 16 miles from Rome.	Pope Hormisdas		*LP* 54.1.
SS. Cosmae et Damianis	526-30	Converted hall/offices of urban prefect, library or medical office.	Pope Felix IV. Authorisation by Athalaric and/or Amalasuntha.		*LP* 56.2; *ICUR*, II.1, pp. 71, 134, 152.
Hostel for strangers (Via Lata)	c.540	With oratory dedicated to the Mother of God.	Belisarius	‘Properties and gifts'.	*LP* 61.2.
Monasterium S. Iuvenalis		On the Via Flamminia close to the city of Horta.	Belisarius	‘Properties and gifts'.	*LP* 61.2.
SS. Cyrici et Julitae	537-45	Converted reception hall of a probably fourth-century domus. 22m long and 12m wide.	Pope Vigilius		*CBCR*, IV, pp. 37-50.
SS. Philippi et Iacobi	556-74	Work started under Pelagius I and was completed under John III.	Popes Pelagius I and John III		*LP* 62.3 & 63.1.
S. Ermetis	579-90	Sixth-century transformation of a cemeterial basilica based in catacombs of St Basilla.	Pope Pelagius II		*LP* 65.2; *CBCR*, I, pp. 195-208
St Laurence's (2)	579-90	New basilica *ad corpus* alongside the *basilica maior*.	Pope Pelagius II		*LP* 65.2; *ICUR*, II.1, pp. 63, 106, 157.
Monasterium	579-90	Pope’s conversion of his residence.	Pope Pelagius II		*LP* 65.2.
Monasterium S. Pancrati ad Basilicam Constantinianam	before 593	Monastery near the Lateran. Not clear if 'basilical' in the sixth century.	Not known.		Gregory I, *Dialogues* II.

SS. Nerei et Achillei	End of sixth/beginning of seventh century	Construction of church on Via Ardeatina, if distinguishable from John I's works.	Not Known		*CBCR*, III, pp. 135-42, 51-52.
Xenodochium 'de via nova'	before 590	Conversion of the residence.	Silvia, mother of Gregory I.		Gregory I, *Ep.* 1.42.
Monasterium S. Victoris ad S. Pancratium.	594-604	Basilical monastery serving S. Pancrati.	Pope Gregory I		Gregory I, *Ep*. 4.18.
S. Agathae Gothorum	594-604	Conversion of Ricimer's Arian Church	Pope Gregory I		*LP* 66.4.
S. Iohannis ('a Porta Latina')	c.554-c.600	Sixth-century conversion; probably for travellers, entering and leaving the city.	Byzantine administration.		*CBCR*, I, pp. 302-16.
S. Mariae Antiquae	no earlier than 564-76	Conversion into a palace chapel. Not under the control of the Roman Church in sixth century.	Narses or Byzantine administration.		*CBCR*, II, pp. 249-68.[10]
(Oratory of the Forty Martyrs)	before 571	Building repurposed as private funerary chapel.	Byzantine administration or city elite engaged in commerce.		See Note.[11]
S. Caesarii	after 554	Oratory. 'Somewhere within the Domus Augustana-Flavia'.	Byzantine administration.		*CBCR*, I, p. 113; *LTUR*, 1.213. Note.[12]
S. Mariae 'in Domnica'.	late 6th century	Theotokos Dedication. Later known as a *diaconia*.	Byzantine aristocrat Dominica?		See Note.[13]
S. Mariae 'in Aquiro'		Theotokos Dedication. Later known as a *diaconia*.	Byzantine administration?		See Note.[14]
S. Mariae 'in Via Lata'	late 6th century	Theotokos Dedication. Later known as a *diaconia*.	Byzantine administration?		See Note.[15]

S. Mariae 'in Cosmedin'	late 6th century	A late 6th century construction. Later a *diaconia*.	Byzantine administration?		See Note.[16]
S. Mariae 'in Capitolio'	late 6th century	Church and Monastery.	Narses or Byzantine administration?		See Note.[17]
S. Theodori	soon after 554	Dedicated to the most important military saint. Later Diaconia.	Byzantine administration?		See Note.[18]

[1] Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship*, p. 108.
[2] Camerlenghi, *St Paul's Outside the Walls,* p.34.
[3] Probably a contrived parity with St Peter's as the churches were not the same size at the time.
[4] Hellström, 'On the Form and Function of Constantine's Circiform Funerary Basilicas in Rome'.
[5] For these references to the Liberian Catalogue, see *Le* Liber Pontificalis, p. 8.
[6] Pietri attributed the foundation to Damasus. *Roma Cristiana*, I, 461 ff.
[7] See page 131, n. 103 above.
[8] Kinney 'Expanding the Christian Footprint', p. 70.
[9] Maskarinec, *City of Saints*, pp. 101-2.
[10] Moralee, *Rome's Holy Mountain*, pp. 87-88.
[11] Moralee, *Rome's Holy Mountain*, p. 87.
[12] Maskarinec, *City of Saints*, p. 56.
[13] Coates-Stephens, 'Byzantine Building Patronage', pp. 158-64.
[14] As Note 13.
[15] As Note 13.
[16] As Note 13.
[17] Moralee, *Rome's Holy Mountain*, pp. 94-98.
[18] As Note 13.

Table 4.2 **Decoration, Additions, Alterations, Repairs (312-c.600)**

Church / Location	Date	Works Carried Out	Patron	Sources
A. Period 312-476				
First Sub-period (312-366)				
St Peter's Font	324-37	Font of porphyry stone, porphyry column with golden basin, gold lamb, silver statues of the Saviour and John the Baptist.	Emperor Constantine	*LP* 34.13.
S. Agnae	352-66	The decoration of tomb of Agnes with marble tablets.	Pope Liberius	*LP* 37.7.
Unknown	352-66	Provision of an apse in the fifth region of Rome.	Pope Liberius	*Gesta Liberii*, *PL* 8, col. 1393.
St Peter's	c.359	Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus.	Junius Bassus	See Note.[1]
Second Sub-period (366-432)				
S. Anastasiae	366-84	Decoration for apse.	Pope Damasus	*ICUR*, II.1, p. 24, no. 25 and p. 150, no. 18.
S. Sebastiani	366-84	Platonia (large mausoleum).	Pope Damasus	*LP* 39.2.
St Peter's	366-84	Installation of Baptistry.	Pope Damasus	*ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4098.
St Peter's	366-84	Marble decoration, possibly at the baptistry.	Pope Damasus and aristocrat Anastasia	*ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4097.
Titulus Damasi	366-84?	A baptistry.	Pope Damasus?	*ICUR*, II.1, p. 150, no. 19.
Cemeteries	366-84	Epigrams popularising sites of saints and martyrs.	Pope Damasus	*Epigrammata*

St Peter's	390-410	Sarcophagus of Sextus Petronius Probus in Mausoleum of the Anicii.	Anicia Faltonia Proba (widow)	*ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4219.
St Laurence's	397-400	Decoration and restoration of building and mosaic/fresco in apse	Presbyter Leopardus	See page 131, note 107.
S. Anastasiae	402-08	Installation of baptistry.	Longinianus, Urban Prefect	*ICUR*, II.1, p. 24, no. 19; *CBCR*, I, pp. 43-48, 62-63; Brandenburg, pp. 134-36.
S. Agnae	401-17	Repair of Roof.	Innocent I	*LP* 42.7.
Pudentis (S. Pudentianae)	401-17	Marble revetment and paintings (related to construction).	Presbyters Leopardus, Illicius and Maximus	De Rossi, *Musaici*, 1899, p. 27.
Catacomb of Hippolytus	401-17	Unspecified building/memoria.	Presbyter Illicius	*ICUR*, II.1, p. 57.
S. Sebastiani	401-17	Chancel screen?	Presbyters Proclinus and Ursus (of *titulus* Byzanti)	*ILCV*, I, no. 1776.
St Laurence's	406	Sarcophagus of Licentius.		*CBCR*, II, p. 8: De Rossi, *BAC*, I, 1863, pp. 6 ff.
St Laurence's	425/ 438	Sarcophagus of Flavius Magnus.		*CBCR*, II, p. 9: De Rossi, *BAC*, I, 1863, pp. 14 ff.
Basilica Constantiniana	426-30	Decoration of apse?	Flavius Felix and Padusia (aristocrats)	*CBCR*, V, p. 10; *ICUR*, II.1, p. 149, no. 17.
Third Sub-period (432-76)				
St Laurence's	432-40	Remodelling and redecoration of the *confessio.*	Pope Sixtus III	*LP* 46.5.
St Peter's	432-40	Decoration of the *confessio.*	Pope Sixtus III	*LP* 46.4.

S. Mariae	432-40	Font for baptistry.	Pope Sixtus III	*LP* 46.3.
Baptisterium (at the Lateran)	432-40	The setting up of 8 porphyry columns; project completed by Hilarus?	Pope Sixtus III	*LP* 46.7.
Basilica Constantiniana	432-40	Construction of the silver *Fastigium*.	Valentinian III	*LP* 46.4.
St Peter's	432-40	Gold image with 12 portals, place over Peter's *confessio.*	Valentinian III	*LP* 46.4.
St Paul's	432-40	Construction of the *confessio.*	Valentinian III	*LP* 46.5.
S Marcelli	380-450	Baptistry.	Not Known	Brandenburg, pp. 164-65.
Basilica Constantiniana	440-61	Construction of apse-vault.	Pope Leo I	*LP* 47.6.
St Peter's	440-61	Renewal of basilica and apse-vault.	Pope Leo I	*LP* 47.6.
St Peter's	440-61	Mosaic on the eastern façade.	Ex-Prefect Marinianus and wife Anastasia	*ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4102.
S Paul's	440-61	42 frescoes of scenes from the Old and New Testaments.	Pope Leo I / Empress Galla Placidia?	Note
S Paul's	440-61	Repair after lightening.	Pope Leo I / Empress Galla Placidia?	*LP* 47.6; *ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4784.
Oratorium S. Iohannis Baptistae (at Lateran Baptistry)	461-68	Construction of the c*onfessio* with silver, a gold cross and precious stones.	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.2.
Oratorium Sanctae Crucis (at Lateran Baptistry)	461-68	Construction of the *confessio* with silver, a gold cross and precious stones. Also, silver doors, a gold arch supported by onyx columns and gold lamb; fountain and triple porch, striped porphyry columns and basin, decorated on all sides with mosaics and Aquitanian Tripolitan, porphyry columns.	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.2-4.
S. Anastasiae	461-68	Decoration of apse?	Pope Hilarus and Severus and Cassia (aristocrats?)	*ICUR*, II.1, p.24, no. 25; *CBCR*, I, pp. 43-48, 62-63.

Salvatoris	462-70	Apse mosaic, part of the construction.	Ricimer, *Magister Utriusqu Militiae*	*ILCV*, 1637; *ICUR*, II, 438.
St Peter's	468-83	Construction of Porticos in the Atrium.	Pope Simplicius	*ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4104.
B. Decoration, Additions, Alterations, Repairs 476-c.600				
St Laurence's	496-98	Construction of *Confessio* with silver (100 pounds).	Pope Anastasius II	*LP* 52.1.
S. Agnae	498-514	Restoration of apse and basilica.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.10.
SS. Iohannis et Pauli	498-514	New staircase behind the apse.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.9.
S. Pancrati	498-514	Provision of a silver arch and the renovation of the cemetery.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.8; Laurentian Fragment 52.15.
Cimiterium Iordanorum	498-514	Improvement of the cemetery.	Pope Symmachus	LP, 53.11.
S. Felicitatis	498-514	Repair of church building liable to collapse.	Pope Symmachus	LP 53.10.
S. Andreae (St Peter's)	498-514	A silver canopy, a *confessio* and 3 silver arches.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.6.
Oratorium S. Tomae	498-514	Construction of *confessio* with silver and silver arch.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.6.
Confessio S. Cassiani et SS. Proti and Yacinti	498-514	Construction of c*onfessio* with silver, and a silver arch.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.6.
Oratorium S. Apollinaris (S. Andreae)	498-514	Construction of c*onfessio* with silver with silver arch.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.6.
Oratorium S. Sossi (S. Andreae)	498-514	Construction of *confessio* with silver.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.6.
Oratotium Sanctae Crucis (St Peter's font)	498-514	Construction of c*onfessio* with silver.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.7.

Oratoria S. Iohannis Evangelistae et Iohannis Baptistae (St Peter's font)	498-514	Construction of c*onfessiones* with silver and arches.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.7.
St Peter's	498-514	Decoration of basilica with marble; marble adornments at the fountain; enclosure of atrium widening of steps; construction of episcopal rooms, two fountains; a convenience for people; steps to S. Andreae.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.7.
S Paul's	498-514	Renewal of apse; provision of a picture behind and a silver image above the *confessio;* construction of apse-vault, a *matroneum*, steps in front of basilica, and a bath; provision of water. Installation of baptistry?	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.8.
S. Agathae	498-514	Font with 2 silver arches — linked with construction.	Pope Symmachus	LP, 53.8.
S. Pancratis	498-514	Silver arch and bath — part of the construction of basilica.	Pope Symmachus	LP, 53.8.
S. Archangeli Michaelis	498-514	Enlargement of Basilica, building of steps, provision of water.	Pope Symmachus	LP, 53.9.
SS. Silvestri et Martini	498-514	Silver canopy over altar — part of the construction of basilica.	Pope Symmachus	LP, 53.9.
St Peter's	after 500?	Repair of roof.	Theoderic the Great?	Brick stamps?[2]
S. Mariae	after 500?	Repair of roof.	Theoderic the Great?	Brick stamps?[3]
St Peter's	514-23	Provision of beam covered in silver weighing 1040 pounds.	Pope Hormisdas	*LP* 54.10; *ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4115.
S. Clementis	514-23	Altar and ciborium.	Presbyter Mercurius (later Pope John II) and co-priests	*LTUR*, I, 278.
St Peter's	523-26	Continuation of work in the atrium.	Pope John I	*ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4116.

Cemetery SS. Nerei et Achillei (Via Ardeatina),	523-26	Rebuilding (*refecit).*	Pope John I	*LP* 55.7.
Cemeteries SS. Felicis and Adaucti and S. Priscillae (both Via Salaria)	523-26	renovation (*renovavi*t).		*LP* 55.7.
S. Stephani in celio monte	523-530	Mosaics and marble revetment.	Popes John I and/or Felix IV	*ICUR*, II.1, p.152, nos. 29 and 32**;** *CBCR*, IV, pp. 199-240.
SS. Cosmae et Damianis	526-30	Apse Mosaic (and church furniture?) — part of conversion.	Pope Felix IV	*ICUR*, II.1: pp. 71, 134, 152; *ILCV*, 1, no. 1784.
S. Saturnini (at cemetery of Traso, Via Salaria Nova)	526-30	Complete rebuilding of the church destroyed by fire.	Pope Felix IV	LP, 56.2.
S. Clementis	533-35	Chancel screens of Carrara marble from Constantinople.	Pope John II	*CBCR*, I, p. 119: De Rossi, *BAC*, 1870, p. 144.
S. Pudentis (S. Pudentianae)	536-7	Chancel Pergola?	Presbyter Hilarus	*CBCR*, III, p 280.
S. Marcelli	probably 6th century	Pavement of colourful mosaic tesserae with simple designs.	Not known	Brandenburg, pp. 164-65.
S. Chrysogoni	Sixth or seventh century	Walling up doorways, erecting a side-room, creating choir screens, possibly the *confessio*, and the rectangular bema.	Not known	*CBCR*, I, p. 163.
S. Marci	6th century	Renovation.	Not known.	*CBCR*, II, p. 246.
Cemeteries'	561-74	Restotration (*restauravit*).	John III	*LP* 63.1.
St Peter's	579-90	Work on the altar (*in altare*).	Pope Pelagius II	*ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4117.
St Peter's	579-90	Panels over St Peter's body.	Pope Pelagius II	*LP* 65.2.

S. Agathae Gothorum	c.592	Mosaics and frescos — part of the conversion.	Pope Gregory I	*CBCR*, I, pp. 2-12.
St Peter's	590-604	Structural arrangements for *confessio.* Silver canopy with 4 columns over the altar; gold decoration.	Pope Gregory I	*LP* 66.4.
St Paul's	590-604	Structural arrangements for the *confessio.*	Pope Gregory I	*LP* 66.4.
St Paul's	590-604	Provision of lighting.	Pope Gregory I	Gregory I, *Ep.* 14.14.

[1] Huskinson, *Concordia Apostolorum*, pp. 18-24 and 26.
[2] Westall, 'Theoderic Patron of the Churches of Rome?', pp. 119-8.
[3] As Note 2.

Table 4.3 Liturgical Furnishings and Vessels (312-c.600)

Donations	Date	Furnishings and Vessels	Patrons	Source
A. PERIOD 312-476				
First Sub-period (312-366)				
Basilica Constantiniana	312-37	1 silver *fastigium* with 50 gold dolphins and chains; 4 gold crowns with 20 dolphins; 7 silver altars; 7 gold and 16 silver patens; 7 gold, 20 silver and 1 coral *scyphi*; 2 gold and 20 silver *amae*; 40 gold and 50 silver chalices; 1 gold and 46 silver chandeliers (1 with 20 dolphins); 40 silver lights; 25 silver chandeliers; 75 silver candlestick chandeliers; 3 silver *metretae* and 7 brass candelabra.	Emperor Constantine	*LP* 34.9-11.
St Peter's	324-29	Gold Cross (150 lbs) with inscription.	Constantine and Helena	*LP* 34.17; *ICUR-NS*, II, no. 4093
St Peter's	324-37	4 brass candelabra; 3 gold (with jewels) and 20 silver chalices; 2 silver *metratae*; 2 gold and 5 silver *amae*; 1 gold (with jewels) and 5 silver patens; 1 gold crown with 50 dolphins; 62 silver lights (32 with dolphins); 1 silver altar, chased with gold and with jewels; 1 gold censer with 60 jewels.	Emperor Constantine	*LP* 34.18.
St Paul's	312-337	1 gold cross (150 lbs). 'He placed and arranged all the sacred vessels of gold, silver and bronze…just as at St Peter's'.	Emperor Constantine	*LP* 34.21.
Basilica in palatio sessoriano	312-337	4 silver candelabra, 50 silver chandeliers, 1 gold and 3 silver *scyphi*, 5 gold and 10 silver chalices, 1 silver paten chased with gold, 1 silver altar, 3 silver *amae*.	Emperor Constantine	*LP* 34.22.
S. Agnae	312-337	1 gold and 2 silver patens, 1 gold and 5 chalices, 1 gold (with 30 dolphins) and 30 silver and 40 brass chandeliers, 40 brass candlesticks, 1 gold lantern.	Emperor Constantine	*LP* 34.23.
St Laurence's	312-337	1 gold and 2 silver patens, 1 gold and 2 silver s*cyphi*, 10 silver chalices, 2 silver *amae*, 30 silver lights, 1 *metreta*.	Emperor Constantine	*LP* 34.24.
SS. Marcellini et Petri	312-337	3 gold and 2 silver patens, 2 gold and 5 silver *scyphi*, 4 silver candelabra, 1 gold crown, 3 gold and 20 silver chalices, 2 gold and 4 silver *amae*, 2 silver altars.	Emperor Constantine	LP 34.26-27.
Titulus Equitii	314-25	2 silver *scyphi*, 1 gold chalice, 5 service chalices, 2 silver *amae*, 1 silver paten, 10 crown and 20 bronze lights, 12 bronze candlestick chandeliers.	Pope Silvester	*LP* 34.3.

Titulus Equitii	312-337	1 silver paten, 1 silver *ama*, 2 silver *scyphi*, 10 silver chandeliers, 16 bronze candlestick chandeliers, 5 silver chalices.	Emperor Constantine	*LP* 34.33.
Titulus Marci	336	1 silver paten, 2 silver *amae*, 1 silver *scyphus*, 3 silver chalices, 1 silver crown.	Pope Marcus	*LP* 35.4.
Titulus Callisti	337-52	No Information.		
Basilica Julii	337-52	No Information.		
S. Valentini	337-52	No Information.		
Basilica Liberii	352-66	No Information.		
Second Sub-period 366-432				
Titulus S. Anastasiae	366-84?	No Information		
Titulus Damasi	366-84	1 silver paten, 1 silver *ama*, 1 *scyphus*, 5 silver service chalices, 5 silver crowns, 16 bronze candlestick chandeliers.	Damasus	*LP* 39.4.
Titulus Fasciolae (SS. Nerei et Achillei)	366-84	No Information.		
Titulus Marcelli	380-450	No Information.		
Titulus Pudentis (S. Pudentianae)	387 or 390-401/417.	No Information.		
Titulus Clementis (S. Clementis)	End of 4th century	No Information.		
Titulus Crescentianae	399-402	No Information.		
Titulus Vestinae	401-17	2 silver patens, 2 silver *amae*, 12 silver crowns, 1 silver chandelier, 4 silver candlesticks, 1 silver tower with paten. And for baptism: 1 silver stag, 1 silver vessel, 1 vessel, 2 patens, 1 silver *scyphus*, 5 silver chalices, 3 silver chalices, 1 silver basin, 16 bronze chandeliers, 20 bronze candlestick chandeliers.	Vestina (aristocrat)	*LP* 42.4-5.
Titulus Pammachii (SS. Iohannis et Pauli)	c.410	No Information.		
Titulus Sabinae	425-32	No Information.		
S. Petri in vinculis (1)	432-40	No Information.		

Oratorium S. Felicitatis	418-22	1 silver paten, 1 silver *scyphus*, 1 silver *ama*, 2 silver chalices, 3 silver crowns.	Pope Boniface	*LP* 44.6.
St Peter's	422-32	1 silver chandelier, 24 silver candlesticks.	Pope Celestine	*LP* 45.2.
St Paul's	422-32	1 silver chandelier, 24 silver candlesticks.	Pope Celestine	*LP* 45.2.
Basilica Julii	422-32	1 silver paten, 2 silver *scyphi*, 2 silver *amae*, 5 silver chalices, 5 silver handbasins, 2 silver candelabra, 24 bronze candlestick chandeliers, 10 silver crowns.	Pope Celestine	*LP* 45.2.
Third Sub-period (432-76)				
S. Mariae	432-40	1 silver altar (300 pounds), 3 silver patens, 4 silver *amae*, 1 gold scyphus 5 silver *scyphi*, 2 gold chalices, 10 silver service chalices, 1 silver handbasin, 1 silver crown light, 34 silver crown lights, 4 silver candelabra, 1 silver censer, 24 brass candlestick chandeliers. 1 silver stag, all sacred vessels for baptism.	Pope Sixtus III	*LP* 46.3.
St Laurence's	432-40	3 silver patens, 3 silver *amae*, 4 silver *scyphi*, 1 gold *scyphi*, 1 gold lantern, 12, silver service chalices, 1 silver handbasin, 1 baptism service, 1 brass shell, 30 silver crowns, 3 chandeliers, 2 silver candelabra, 24 bronze candlesticks, 60 bronze lights.	Pope Sixtus III	*LP* 46.6-7.
St Peter's	432-40	1 gold *scyphus.*	Pope Sixtus III	*LP* 46.7.
St Paul's	432-40	1 gold *scyphus.*	Pope Sixtus III	*LP* 46.7.
St Laurence's	432-40	1 gold *scyphus* and 15 gold chalices.	Pope Sixtus III	*LP* 46.7.
All *Tituli*	440-61	Replaced all consecrated silver services throughout all the *tituli* after the Vandal disaster.	Pope Leo I	*LP* 47.6.
St Peter's	461-68	2 gold *scyphi*, 10 silver chalices, 2 silver *amae*, 24 chandeliers.	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.7.
St Paul's	461-68	2 gold scyphi, 4 silver *scyphi*, 10 (silver) service chalices, 2 silver *amae.*	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.8.
St Laurence's the martyr	461-68	1 gold and jewelled *scyphus*, 1 gold lantern, I gold *scyphus*, 2 gold lamps, I gold chandelier, I silver tower, 3 silver *scyphi*, 12 (silver) service chalices, 1 silver altar, 10 silver lamps, 2 silver *amae*,	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.9.
St Laurence's	461-68	10 silver chandeliers, 26 bronze chandeliers, silver services for baptism and penance, 50 bronze lights.	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.10.
Basilica Constantiniana	461-68	10 silver chandeliers, 2 gold *scyphi*, 5 gold chalices, 5 silver *scyphi*, 20 silver service chalices, 5 silver *amae*.	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.6.

Oratorium S. Iohannis Baptistae (at the Lateran)	461-68	At the *confessio*, 1 silver crown, 1 chandelier; at the font, 1 gold lantern, 3 silver stags, 1 silver tower, 1 gold dove.	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.5.
Oratorium S. Iohannis Evangelistae (at the Lateran)	461-68	At the *confessio*, 1 gold cross.	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.2.
Oratory S. Crucis (at the Lateran)	461-68	At the *confessio*, 1 gold cross with jewels, 1 gold crown, 1 light with dolphins, 4, gold lamps.	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.3-4.
All *Tituli* (for services at *stationes)*	461-68	1 gold *scyphus*, 25 silver *scyphi* for *tituli*, 25 *amae*, 50 (silver) service chalices.	Pope Hilarus	*LP* 48.11.
St Peter's	468-83	1 gold *scyphus* (here?), 16 silver chandeliers.	Pope Simplicius	*LP* 49.5.
B. PERIOD 476-c.600				
St Peter's	498-514	20 silver chandeliers, 22 silver arches.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.10.
Oratorium Sanctae Crucis (St Peter's font)	498-514	Cross of gold with jewels enclosing 'the Lord's wood'.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.7.
St Paul's	498-514	Silver image of the Saviour and the 12 apostles.	Pope Symmachus	*LP* 53.8.
St Peter's?	514-23	Diadem with precious jewels.	King Clovis	*LP* 54.10.
St Peter's	519-23	Gospels with gold covers and precious jewels; 1 gold paten; 2 silver patens; 1 gold *scyphus* with jewels; 1 gold *scyphus* with a diadem; 3 silver-gilt scyphi; I electrum bowl; 2 gold wax chests; purple-dyed pallia with gold patches of cloth and imperial vesture; 1 incense burner.	Emperor Justin	*LP* 54.10.
St Peter's	514-23	2 silver candlesticks	King Theoderic	*LP* 54.10.
Basilica Constantiniana	514-23	1 silver arch before the altar; 16 silver chandeliers.	Pope Hormisdas	*LP* 54.11.
St Paul's	514-23	2 silver arches; 16 silver chandeliers; 3 silver *amae*; 6 silver *scyphi* (for stational use).	Pope Hormisdas	*LP* 54.11.
'Many basilicas' (per multas basilicas)	514-23	different (*diversa*) gold and silver ornaments.	Pope Hormisdas	Cononian epitome 54, *Le* LP, p. 100.

St Peter's, St Paul's, St Laurence's, S. Mariae	523-26	1 gold paten with jewels, 1 gold chalice with jewels, 5 silver *scyphi*, 15 gold-worked *pallia.*	Emperor Justin I but allocated by Pope John I	*LP* 55.7.
St Peter's	523-26	Adornment of prase and jacinth jewels for the *confessio.*	Not known	*LP* 55.7.
St Peter's?	533-35	1 gold scyphus with prases and pearls; 4 silver chalices; 1 silver scyphi; 4 purple-dyed gold-worked *pallia.*	Emperor Justinian	*LP* 58.2.
St Peter's	537-51	1 gold cross with jewels; 2 large silver-gilt candlesticks.	Belisarius	*LP* 61.2.
'All Churches'	556-61	Restoration of all gold and silver vessels and *pallia.*	Pope Pelagius I	*LP* 62.3.
St Peter's?	565-74	Cross of Justin II.	Emperor Justin II and Empress Sophia	Note.[1]
St Peter's	590-604	1 purple-dyed cloth over St Peter's body.	Pope Gregory I	*LP* 66.4.

[1] A. McClanan, *Representations of Early Byzantine Empresses*, The New Middle Ages (New York, 2002).

Table 4.4 Church of Rome-Aristocratic Relations (476-c.600)

Date	Event	Facts bearing on Church of Rome-Aristocrats' Interaction	Sources and/or References
476	Letter from Pope Simplicius to Acacius.	Pope Simplicius used 'our sons' *illustris vir* Latinus and *vir spectabilis* Madusius as messengers.	*CA* 57.1.
483	Basilius, praetorian prefect and patrician, deputy (*agens etiam vices*) to Odoacer (*praecellentissimi regis)*, issued a *scriptura*.	The *scriptura* declared that an election of a pope was not to be celebrated without consulting the senate. Further, it declared under anathema that church property was not to be sold or given away. The *scriptura* was issued with the agreement of Pope Simplicius.	*Acta synhodorum habitarum Romae*, DII, 4. (p. 445).
489	Pope Felix III's instruction to the senator Andromachus, Odoacer's envoy to Constantinople.	Andromachus was to discuss with Acacius, archbishop of Constantinople, a possible settlement of the Acacian schism. 'Andromachus, who was copiously instructed by us … to encourage Acacius to come to his senses …'	Gelasius, *Ep.* 10.7, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum,* p. 346; *PLRE*, IIA, p. 89.
492-3?	Gelasius's *commoritorium* to ex-consul Flavius Anicius Probus Faustus Niger, leader of a senatorial embassy sent by Theoderic.	Gelasius's letter is a brief for Faustus on what to say about the excommunication of Acacius, who had died.	Gelasius, *Ep.* 10, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, pp.341-48; *PLRE*, IIA, pp. 454-56.
495	The Roman Synod under the direction of Pope Gelasius re-instated Misenus.	The synod comprised 48 bishops and 65 priests. Two aristocrats, Amandianus *vir illustris* and Diogenianus *vir spectabilis,* were in attendance.	*CA* 103.
492-96	Pope Gelasius's letter against Andromachus and others on Lupercalia.	Gelasius criticised the annual aristocratic pagan practice. Andromachus was Pope Felix III's intermediary in 489.	*CA* 100.
498-506/7	Laurentian Schism.	Symmachus supported by senators led by the ex-consul Flavius Anicius Probus Faustus Niger; Laurence by those led by Rufinus Postumius Festus and Petronius Probinus.	*LP* 53.3-5; *PLRE,* IIA, pp.454-56 and 467-68 and IIB, pp. 909-10.
502	Roman Synod of 502: the s*criptura* of 483 revisited.	The *scriptura* was declared invalid: no layman may declare anathema, make decrees in the Church or determine anything concerning the wealth of the Church.	*Acta synhodorum habitarum Romae*, DII, paras. 6, 8, 10. (pp. 446-47).
512	Pope, clergy and Nobles discussed Acacian schism.	Meeting attended by Pope Symmachus, Boethius, and John (later Pope John I) and clerics and nobles to discuss a letter of the Eastern bishops about the Acacian schism.	Boethius Tractate 5.

516	Pope Hormisdas's embassy to the emperor Anastasius that tried unsuccessfully to end the Acacian schism.	Delegates comprised Bishop Ennodius of Ticinum and Bishop Fortunatus of Catina, Venantius, a priest of the city of Rome, Vitalis, a deacon and Hilarus, a notary of the apostolic see. On a second occasion, the delegates were Ennodius and Bishop Peregrinus of Misenum.	*CA* 115, 116 *(Indiculus)*, 116.b *(Libellus)*, 124, 125, 126, 127; *LP*, 54. 3 (second occasion).
518?	Initial contact between Hormisdas and the emperor Justin, following the latter's accession.	Alexander *vir spectabilis* was bearer of the letter of congratulation from the pope. Gratus *vir spectabilis, sacri consistorii comes et magister scrinii memoriae*, was the emperor Justin's envoy.	*CA* 142,143, 147; *PLRE*, IIA, pp. 57 and 519.
519	Pope Hormisdas's embassy to the emperor Justin to end the Acacian schism.	Delegates comprised Bishop Germanus of Capua and Bishop John, Deacons Felix and Dioscorus of the apostolic see, the presbyter Blandus and the notary Peter.	*CA* 149, 150, 158 (*Indiculus); LP* 54.5.
525-26?	Pope John I sent to Constantinople by Theoderic to plead for cessation of the emperor Justin's anti-Arian measures.	Delegates other than John: Bishop Ecclesius of Ravenna, Eusebius of Fanum Fortunae, Sabinus of Campania and 'two others'; also, the senators and ex-consuls Theodore, Importunus and Agapetus, and (another) Agapetus, a patrician.	*Anonymous Velasianus*, 15.90; *LP*, 55.2.
526	The senate accepted Theoderic's decision on the appointment of Felix IV as pope.	The senate may have made representations to Theoderic over the disputed papal election of 530 (there was a vacancy of 58 days and the controversy may have lasted over three months) and senators may have supported different candidates.	Cassiodorus, *Variae*, VIII.15.
530	*Senatus Consultum* against election bribery.	Senate's decree against bribery in papal elections.	Cassiodorus, *Variae*, IX.15.
530-32	Pope Boniface II destroyed document nominating the deacon Vigilius as his successor.	Boniface destroyed the decree by fire in front of the *confessio* of St Peter in the presence of all the *sacerdotes*, clergy and the senate.	*LP* 57.3.
534	Pope John II's acceptance of the Theopaschite formula.	The emperor Justinian sent Bishops Hypatius and Demetrius who also carried John's reply.	*CA* 84.
534	Pope John II's letter to 11 members of the Senate of Constantinople.	A letter sent by John II in response to questions concerning his acceptance of the theopaschite formula.	John II, *Ep. 2*, *PL* 66, cols. 020-024.
536	Pope Agapetus sent to Constantinople by king Theodahad with aristocrats? to persuade Justinian not to invade Italy.	Five bishops and a large retinue (including aristocrats?).	Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici*, ad annum, 536?

Table 4.5 New Saint Cults in Rome in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries

New Saint Cults and Dedications	Location	Date	Patron	Relics?	Source
A. Papal and Other Introductions					
Mary	S. Mariae		Sixtus III	Not clear for the fifth century; the *presepe* was *known* in the sixth?	*LP* 46.3; *CBCR*, III, p. 6
Gervasius & Protasius	*Titulus* Vestinae	401-17	Aristocrat Vestina	Possibly.[1]	*LP* 42.3
Stephen	(1) Basilica in Via Latina	440-61	Aristocrat Demetrias.	Relic cavity under the altar but original?	*LP* 47. 1.
	(2) Oratorium ad Baptisterium Basilicae Constantinanae	461-68	Pope Hilarus	Not known.	*LP*, 48.12
	(3) S. Stephani in celio monte	468-83	Emperors	No.	*LP* 49.1.
John the Baptist	(1) Oratorium ad Baptisterium Basilicae Constantinanae	461-68	Pope Hilarus	*Confessio.*	*LP* 48.2.
	(2) Oratorium (at St Peter's)	498-514	Pope Symmachus	*Confessio.*	*LP*, 53.7
John the Evangelist	(1) Oratorium ad Baptisterium Basilicae Constantinanae	461-68	Pope Hilarus	*Confessio.*	*LP* 48.2
	(2) Oratorium (at St Peter's)	498-514	Pope Symmachus	*Confessio.*	*LP* 53.7

Andrew the apostle	(1) S. Andreae (Catabarbara)	468-83	Gothic general Valila (aristocrat)	Probably not.	*LP* 49.1.
	(2) S. Andreae (at St Peter's)	498-514	Pope Symmachus	*Confessio.*	*LP* 53.6.
Thomas the apostle	Oratorium S. Tomae (S. Andreae)	498-514	Pope Symmachus	*Confessio.*	*LP* 53.6.
Apollinaris, first bishop of Ravenna	Oratorium S. Apollinaris (S. Andreae)	498-514	Pope Symmachus	*Confessio.*	*LP* 53.6.
Cassian of Imola	*Confessio* S. Cassiani et SS. Proti and Yacinti	498-514	Pope Symmachus	*Confessio.*	*LP* 53.6.
Sossius, deacon from Missenum (Campania)	S. Andreae (at St Peter's)	498-514	Pope Symmachus	*Confessio.*	*LP* 53.6.
Protus and Hyacinth	(1) Cemetery of Bassilla on the Via Salaria Vetus	Second half of fourth century		Burial place.	*Elogium* of Protus and Hyacinthus.
	(2) *Confessio* S. Cassiani et SS. Proti and Yacinti	498-514	Pope Symmachus	*Confessio.*	*LP* 53.6: *ICUR-NS,* II, no. 4106.
Martin of Tours	SS. Silvestri et Martini	498-514	Pope Symmachus	Not known.	*LP* 53.9.
Agatha	(1) Basilica in Via Aurelia	498-514	Pope Symmachus	Not known.	*LP* 53.8.
	(2) S. Agathae Gothorum	590-604	Pope Gregory I	Yes. SS. Agatha and Sebastian.	Gregory I, *Dialogues,* III.30.
Cosmas and Damian	(1) Oratorium ad S. Mariam	498-514	Pope Symmachus	Not known	*LP* 53.9.
	(2) SS. Cosmae et Damianis	526-30	Pope Felix IV	Sixth-century altar with *fenestella:* probable contact relics?	Extant altar in crypt.

Theodore	SS. Cosmae et Damianis	526-30	Pope Felix IV	Not known but Sixth-century altar with *fenestella:* probable contact relics?	Mosaic.
Cyricus and Julita	SS. Cyrici et Julitae	537-45	Pope Vigilius?	Probably nut not known.	
Seven Maccabees	SS. Apostolorum (S. Petri in vinculis)	556-61 or 579-90	Pope Pelagius I or II	Yes	Goodson, 'Building for Bodies', p. 62.
Philip and James, apostles	SS. Philippi et Iacobi	556-74	Popes Pelagius I and John III	Yes	*LP* 62.3 and 63.1.
B. Byzantine Administration's Introductions					
Mary, *Theotokos*	S. Maria Antiqua	565-78	Byzantine administration or Narses	Not Known	
	S Maria 'in Domnica'	590-604	Byzantine administration	Not Known	
	S Maria 'in Aquiro'	?	Byzantine administration	Not Known	
	S Maria in Via Lata	554-600	Byzantine administration	Not Known	
	S Maria 'in Cosmedin'	late 6th century?	Byzantine administration	Not Known	
	S. Maria' in Capitolio'	late 6th century?	Byzantine administration or Narses	Not Known	
	S. Iohannis 'a Porta Latina'	550?	Byzantine administration	Not Known	

			Byzantine administration	Not Known	
The Forty Martyrs of Sebaste	Oratorium 'of the Forty Martyrs'	554-600	Byzantine administration	Not Known.	
Caesarius	Oratorium 'somewhere within the Domus Augustana-Flavia' on Palatine Hill.	by time of Gregory I (590-604)	Byzantine administration	Possibly: Maskarinec, *City of Saints,* pp. 56, 61 and 69-70.	
Sergius and Bacchus	SS. Sergii et Bacchi	590-604	Byzantine administration	Not Known.	
Theodore	S. Theodori	later 6th century?	Byzantine administration	Not Known.	

[1] Ambrose is known to have distributed relics. See Wiśniewski, *The Beginnings of the Cult of Relics,* p. 139.

Abbreviations

BAC	*Bulletino di archeologia cristiana*
CBCR	*Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae*
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
ICLV	*Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*,
ICUR	*Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*,
ICUR-NS	*Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*: *nova series,*
LTUR	*Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
PG	*Patrologia Graeca,*
PL	*Patrologia Latina,*
PLRE	*Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Acta Sanctorum quot toto orbe coluntur, 70 vols. (Antwerp, 1643 -)

Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae a CCCCXCVIIII, DI, DII in T. Mommsen (ed.), *Variae Cassiodori senatoris,* Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi, Vol. 12 (Berlin, 1894), pp. 399-455

Agnellus of Ravenna, *The Book of the Pontiffs of the Church of Ravenna,* Medieval Texts in Translation, ed. D.M. Deliyannis (Washington, 2004)

Anonymi Valesiani pars posterior (Excerpta Valesiana) in J.C. Rolfe (trans.), *Ammianus Marcellinus*, Loeb Classical Library (London, 1939), vol 3, pp. 506-69

Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* anonymous translation (Limovia.net, 2013)

Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose, trans. with Introduction by D. Shanter and I. Wood, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 38 (Liverpool, 2002)

Bettensen, H. and C. Maunder (eds.), *Documents of the Christian Church*, 4th edn. (Oxford, 2011)

Boethius, *The Theological Tractates with an English Translation,* trans. H.F. Stewart and E.K. Rand, The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA, 1918)

Cassiodorus, Selected *Variae*, trans. with notes and introduction by S.J.B. Barnish, Translated Texts for Historians no. 12 (Liverpool, 1992)

Coleman-Norton, P.R., *Roman State and Christian Church: A Collection of Legal Documents to A.D. 535,* 3 Vols. (London, 1966)

Collectio Avellana, Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab a.CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collectio, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum no. 35, ed. O. Günther (Vienna, 1895-8)

Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis, ed. by E. von Dobschutz, Texte et Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristilichen Literatur Vol 38.4 (Leipzig, 1912)

Diehl, E., *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, 3 Vols. (Berlin, 1925-31)

De Rossi, G.B. (ed.), *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*, Vols. I-II.1 (1857-88)

De Rossi, G.B., *Musaici cristiani e saggi dei pavimenti delle chiese di Roma anteriori al secolo XV* (Rome, 1899)

Dionysius Exiguus, *Collectio Decretorum Pontificum Romanorum Auctore Dionysio Exiguo*, *PL* 67, cols. 0229-0346

Dionysius Exiguus, *Codex Canonum Ecclesiasticorum Dionysii Exigui sive Codex Canonum Vetus Ecclesiae Romanae, PL* 67, cols. 0135-0544

Epistula Clementis ad Iacobum, in B. Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen II: Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung,* Die griechlichen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, Bd 51 (Berlin, 1965)

Eusebius of Caesarea, *The Ecclesiastical History,* ed. by K. Lake and J.E.L. Oulton, Loeb Classical Library (London, 1926-32); *The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine,* trans. by G.A. Williamson, ed. by A. Louth, (London, 1965/1989)

Frier, B.W. et al., *The Codex of Justinian:* a new annotated translation, with parallel Latin and Greek text based on a translation by Justice Fred H. Blume, 3 vols (Cambridge, 2016)

Gennadius, *De viris inlustribus, PL* 58, cols. 1059-1120A; *Lives of Illustrious Men,* trans. with notes by P. Schaff and H. Wace, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, 1969), pp. 385-402

Gregory I, Letters, *S. Gregorii Magni Registrum Epistularum,* ed. by D. Norberg, Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina Vols. 140 and 140A (Turnhout, 1982-); *The Letters of Gregory the Great,* trans. with Introduction and Notes by J.R.C. Martyn, Medieval Sources in Translation, no. 40, 3 vols (Toronto, 2004)

Gregory I, *XL Homiliarium in evangelia duo libri, PL* 76, cols. 1075-1312; *Forty Gospel Homilies,* trans. D. Hurst (Kalamazoo, 1990)

Gregory I, *Regulae Pastoralis Liber, PL* 77, cols. 13-128; *The Book of Pastoral Rule,* trans. with Introduction by G.E. Demacopoulos (New York, 2007)

St Gregory the Great, *Dialogues,* trans. O.J. Zimmerman, The Fathers of the Church vol. 39 (Washington, 1959)

Gregory of Tours, *Glory of the Martyrs,* trans. with Introduction by R. Van Dam, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 4 (Liverpool, 1988)

Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*. *PG* Vol. 7, Cols. 433-1224; *Against Heresies: Five Books of St Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons,* trans. by J. Kemble (London, 1872)

Jerome. *Liber de viris illustribus, PL* 23, cols. 632-761; *On Illustrious Men,* trans. by T.P. Halton, The Fathers of the Church (Washington, 1999)

Krautheimer, R., et al., *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae, The Early Christian Basilicas of Rome (IV to IX Centuries),* Monumenti di antichità cristiana Series 2, no. 2, 5 Vols. (Rome, 1937-77)

Leo I, *Epistulae, PL* 54; *St Leo the Great Letters,* trans. E. Hunt, The Fathers of the Church, Vol. 34, (New York, 1957)

Leo I, Sermons: *Opera, PL* 54-56*; St Leo the Great Sermons,* trans. J.P. Freeland and A.J. Conway, The Fathers of the Church, Vol. 93 (Washington, 1996)

Liber Pontificalis, ed. L. Duchesne, *Le* Liber Pontificalis: *Texte, Introduction et Commentaire*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1886-92). English translations by R. Davis: *The Book of the Pontiffs* (Liber Pontificalis): *The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Bishops to AD 715*, Translated Texts for Historians no. 6, 3rd edn. (Liverpool, 2010); *The Lives of the Eighth-Century Popes* (Liber Pontificalis): *The Ancient Biographies of Nine Popes from AD 715 to AD 817*, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 13, 2nd edn. (Liverpool, 2007); *The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes* (Liber Pontificalis): *The Ancient Biographies of Ten Popes from AD 817-891*, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 20 (Liverpool, 1995)

Liber Pontificalis, ed. by T. Mommsen, *Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum vol I, Libri Pontificalis, Pars Prior*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1898).

Lydus, John, *Ioannes Lydus, On Powers, Or the Magistracies of the Roman State* (De Magistratibus Reipublicae Romanae), ed. A.C. Bandy (Philadelphia, 1983)

Migne, J.P., *Patrologia Latina*, 217 vols. (Paris, 1841-64)

Migne, J.P., *Patrologia Graeca*, 161 vols. (Paris, 1857-66)

Paulinus of Nola, *The Letters of Paulinus Of Nola*, Ancient Christian Writers, no. 35, vol 1 (New York, 1966)

Paul the Deacon, *History of the Lombards*, trans. W.D. Foulke, ed. E. Peters (Philadelphia, 1974)

Price, R. (ed.), *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553 with related texts on the Three Chapters Controversy*, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 51, 2 vols. (Liverpool, 2009/2012)

Price, R. and M. Gaddis (eds.), *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 45, 3 vols (Liverpool, 2005)

Price, R., P. Booth and C. Cubitt (eds.) *Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649*, Translated Texts for Historians, no. 61 (Liverpool, 2014)

Rufinus, *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia: Books 10 and 11*, trans. by P.R. Amidon (Oxford, 1997)

Sacramentarium Veronese, ed. by L.C. Mohlberg, L. Eizenhöfer and P. Siffrin, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta (Rome, 1956)

Silvagni, A., A Ferrua and D. Mazzoleni (eds.), *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*: *nova series*, 10 vols. (Rome, 1922-85)

Sozomen, *The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, trans with introduction by H. Wace and P. Schaff, Second Series Vol. 2 (Oxford/New York, 1891), pp. 233-427

Sulpicius Severus: The Complete Works, trans. with introduction and notes by R. J. Goodrich, Ancient Christian Writers, No. 70 (New York, 2015)

Thiel, A. (ed.) *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum Genuinae et Quae ad Eos Scriptae Sunt: a S. Hilaro usque ad Pelagium II* (Braunsberg, 1867-68)

Van Roey, A. and P. Allen (eds.), *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, no. 56 (Leuven, 1994)

Secondary Sources

Alchermes, J.D., 'Petrine Politics: Pope Symmachus and the Rotunda of St Andrew at Old St Peter's', *The Catholic Historical Review,* 81 (1995), pp. 1-40

Alchermes, J.D., 'Art and Architecture in the Age of Justinian' in M. Maas (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 343-75

Allen, P., 'Rationales for episcopal letter-collections in late antiquity' in B. Neil and P. Allen (eds.), *Collecting Early Christian Letters: From the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 18-34

Amory, P., *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489-554,* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, Fourth Series, no. 33 (Cambridge 1997)

Anastos, M.V., 'Constantine and Rome: A Survey of Relations between the Byzantine and the Roman Churches' in M.V. Anastos, *Aspects of the Mind of Byzantium: Political Theory, Theology and Ecclesiastical Relations with the See of Rome,* Collected Studies, CS717 (Aldershot, 2001), VIII

Apostolos-Cappadona, D., '"Decorated with luminous mosaics": Image and Liturgy in 5th/6th-Century Roman Church Apse Mosaics', in J. Day and M. Vincent (eds.), *Studia Patristica,* 71 (2014), Papers presented at Conferences on Early Roman Liturgy to 600 (14.11.2009-27.02.2010), pp. 93-110

Arnold. J.J., *Theoderic and the Roman Imperial Restoration* (Cambridge, 2014)

Arnold. J.J., M.S. Bjornlie and K. Sessa (eds.) *A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy,* Brill's Companions to European History, no 9 (Leiden, 2016)

Augenti, A., 'Continuity and Discontinuity of a Seat of Power: the Palatine Hill from the Fifth to the Tenth Century' in J.M.H. Smith (ed.), *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 43-54

Baldovin, J. F., *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development and Meaning of Stational Liturgy,* Orientalia Christiana Analecta, no.228 (Rome, 1987)

Barnes, T.D., *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge MA, 1993)

Barnish, S., 'The Wealth of Iulianus Argentarius: Late Antique Banking and the New Economy', *Byzantion,* 55 (1) (1985), pp. 5-38

Barnish, S., 'Transformation and survival in the western senatorial aristocracy, *c*. AD 400-700', *Papers of the British School at Rome,* 56 (1988), pp. 120-55

Beard, M., ‘Ciceronian Correspondences: Making a Book out of Letters’ in T.P. Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 2002), pp.103-44

Bjornlie, M.S., *Politics and Tradition between Rome, Ravenna and Constantinople: A Study of Cassiodorus and the* Variae*, 527-554*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, Fourth Series, no. 89 (Cambridge, 2013)

Blair-Dixon, K., ‘Memory and authority in sixth-century Rome: The *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Collectio Avellana’* in K. Cooper and J. Hillner (eds,), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome 300-900* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 59-76

Blaudeau, P., ‘Rome contre Alexandrie? L’interprétation pontificale de l’enjeu monophysite (de l’émergence de la controverse eutychienne au schism acacien 448-484)’, *Adamantius,* 12 (2006), pp.140-216

Blaudeau, P., *Le Siège de Rome et L’Orient (448-536): Étude Géo-Ecclésiologique*, Collection de l’École française de Rome, no. 460 (Rome, 2012)

Blaudeau, P., ‘Between Petrine Ideology and Realpolitik: The See of Constantinople in Roman Geo-Ecclesiology (449-536)’ in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds.), *The Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity,* Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity (Oxford, 2012), pp. 364-86

Blaudeau, P., ‘Narrating Papal Authority (440-530): The Adaptation of the *Liber Pontificalis* to the Apostolic See’s Developing Claims’ in G.D. Dunn (ed.), *The Bishop of Rome in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2015), pp. 127-40

Bolgia, C., R. McKitterick and J. Osborne (eds.), *Roman Texts Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas, c.500-1400* (Cambridge 2011)

Booth, P., ‘Orthodox and Heretic in the early Byzantine cult(s) of Saints Cosmos and Damian’, in P. Sarris, M. Dal Santo and P. Booth (eds.), *Age of Saints?* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 114-28

Bowersock, G., *Martyrdom and Rome,* Wiles Lectures (Cambridge, 1995)

Bowes, K., *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2008)

Brandenburg, H., *Ancient Churches of Rome: From the Fourth to the Seventh Centuries. The Dawn of Christian Architecture in the West.* Bilbiothèque de l’Antiquité Tardive, no. 8 (Turnhout, 2005)

Brenk, B., *The Apse, the Image and the Icon: An Historical Perspective of the Apse as a Space for Images,* Spätantike, Frühes Christentum, Byzanz. Reihe B, Studien und Perspecktiven, Bd. 26 (Wiesbaden, 2010)

Brenk, B., ‘Apses, Icons and “Image Propaganda” before Iconoclasm’, *Antiquité Tardive,* 19 (2011), pp. 109-30

Brown, P., ‘Pelagius and his Supporters: Aims and Environment’ in P. Brown, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine* (London, 1972), pp.183-207. Reprinted from *Journal of Theological Studies,* 19(1) (1968), pp. 93-114

Brown, P., ‘The Patrons of Pelagius: The Roman Aristocracy between East and West’ in P. Brown, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine* (London, 1972), pp. 208-26. Reprinted from *Journal of Theological Studies,* 21(1) (1970), pp. 56-72

Brown, P. *The Cult of Saints: its rise and function in Latin Christianity,* Haskell Lectures on the History of Religions (Chicago, 1981)

Brown, P. *The End of the Ancient Other World: Death and Afterlife between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages,* Tanner Lectures (Yale, 1996)

Brown, P., *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire,* The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures (Hanover, 2002)

Brown, P., *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550 AD* (Princeton, 2012)

Brown, P., *The Rise of Western Christendom (*Tenth Anniversary Revised Edition), The Making of Europe (Chichester, 2013)

Brown, P., *Ransom of the Soul: Afterlife and Wealth in Early Western Christianity* (Cambridge MA, 2015)

Brown, P., and R. Lizzi Testa (eds), *Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire: The Breaking of a Dialogue (IVth-VIth Century A.D.),* Proceedings of the International Conference at the Monastery of Bose (October 2008), Christianity and History Series, no. 9 (Zurich, 2011)

Bruun, C., ‘The City of Rome’ in C. Bruun and J. Edmonson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy* (Oxford, 2015), pp. 471-94

Bruun, C. and J. Edmonson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy* (Oxford, 2015)

Caillet, J-P., ‘Dedicator’s Image in the Church Space (4th-7th centuries): the Emergence of a Visual System of Theocratic Power’, *Antiquité Tardive* 19(1) (2011), pp. 149-169

Cain, A. and N. Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2009)

Calvadini, J.C. (ed.), *Gregory the Great: A Symposium,* Notre Dame Studies in Theology, vol. 2 (Notre Dame, 1995)

Camerlenghi, N., *St Paul’s Outside the Walls: A Roman Basilica, from Antiquity to the Modern Era* (Cambridge, 2018)

Cameron, Alan, ‘The Funeral of Junius Bassus’ in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik,* Bd. 139 (2002), pp. 288-292

Cameron, Alan, ‘Anician Myths’, *Journal of Roman Studies,* 102 (2012), pp. 133-171

Cameron, Averil., ‘How to read Heresiology’, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies,* 33(3) (2003), pp. 471-92

Cameron, Averil, 'The Early Cult of the Virgin' in M. Vassilaki (ed.), *Mother of God; Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art* (Farnham, 2005), pp. 3-15

Cameron, Averil, B. Ward-Perkins and M. Whitby (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 14, *Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors AD 425-600* (Cambridge, 2000)

Canning, J., *A History of Medieval Political Thought, 330-1450* (London, 1996)

Carpenter, D.C., *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928* (Princeton, 2001)

Chadwick, H., 'St Peter and St Paul in Rome: The Problem of the *Memoria Apostolorum Ad Catacumbas*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 8(1) (1957), pp 31-51

Chadwick, H., *The Church and Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great*, Oxford History of the Christian Church (Oxford, 2001)

Chadwick, H., *Priscillian of Avilla: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford, 1976)

Charanis, P., *Church and State in the Late Roman Empire: The Religious Policy of Anastasius, 491-518*, University of Wisconsin in Social Sciences and History, no. 26 (Madison, 1939)

Chazelle, C. and C. Cubitt (eds.), *The Crisis of Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth Century Mediterranean*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages (Turnhout, 2007)

Christie, N., *From Constantine to Charlemagne: An Archaeology of Italy, AD 300-800* (Aldershot, 2006)

Coates-Stephens, R., 'Byzantine Building Patronage in Post Re-Conquest Rome' in M. Ghilardi et al. (eds.), *Les Cités de l'Italie tardo-antique* (*IVe-VIe siècle*): *Institutions, Économie, Culture et Religion* (Rome, 2006), pp. 149-66.

Coates-Stephens, R., 'San Saba and the *Xenodochium de Via Nova', Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana*, 83 (2007), pp. 223-56

Cohen, S., *Heresy, Authority and the Bishops of Rome in the Fifth Century: Leo I (440-461) and Gelasius (492-496)*, unpublished PhD thesis (Toronto, 2014)

Cohen, S., 'Schism and the Polemic of Heresy: Manichaeism and the Representation of Papal Authority in the *Liber Pontificalis*', *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 8(1) (2015), pp. 195-230

Colgrave, B., 'Pilgrimages to Rome in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries' in E.B. Atwood and A.A. Hill (eds.), *Studies in Language, Literature and Culture of the Middle Ages and Later* (Austin, 1969), pp. 156-72

Connell, M.F., *The Church in Fifth Century Rome: The Letter of Innocent I to Decentius of Gubbio* (Grove Books Cambridge, 2002)

Conran, J. and K. Thelen, 'Institutional Change' in O. Fioretos, T.G. Falleti and A. Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (Oxford, 2016), pp. 51-70

Constable, G., 'The commemoration of the dead in early Medieval Europe' in J.M.H. Smith, (ed,), *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in honour of Donald A. Bullough* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 169-96

Cooper, K., 'The martyr, the matron and the bishop: the matron Lucina and politics of the martyr cult in the fifth and sixth century Rome', *Early Medieval Europe,* 8 (1999), pp. 297-317

Cooper, K. and J. Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900* (Cambridge, 2007)

Costambeys, M., 'Review article: Property, ideology and territorial power of the papacy in the early Middle Ages', *Early Medieval Europe,* 9(3) (2000), pp. 367-96

Costambeys, M. and C. Leyser, 'To be the neighbour of St Stephen: Patronage, martyr cult and Roman monasteries, c.600-900' in K. Cooper, K., and J. Hillner, (eds.) *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900* (Cambridge, 2007) pp. 262-287.

Curran, J., *Pagan City and Roman Capital: Rome in the Fourth Century*, Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford, 2000).

Daley, B.E., 'Position and Patronage in the Early Church: The original meaning of primacy of honour.' *Journal of Theological Studies,* 44(2) (1993), pp. 529-53

Dal Santo, M., 'Gregory the Great and Eustrasius of Constantinople: The Dialogues in the Miracles of the Italian Fathers as an Apology for the Cult of Saints', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 17(3) (2009), pp. 421-55

Dal Santo, M., *Debating the Saints' Cult in the Age of Gregory the Great,* Oxford Studies in Byzantium (Oxford, 2012)

Davis, L.D., *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology,* Theology and Life Series, no. 21 (Collegeville, 1983)

D'Avray, D., 'Half a Century of Research on the First Papal Decretals (to c.440)', *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* 35 (2017)**,** pp. 331-374

De Blaauw, S., *Cultus et Décor: liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medieval: Basilica Salvatoris, Sanctae Mariae, Sancti Petri,* Studi e Testi (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana) 355-356, 2 vols. (Vatican, 1994)

Deferrari, R.J., *The Sources of Catholic Dogma,* tr. from H. Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum.* 13th edn. (Washington, 1955)

De Gaiffier, B., 'Un prologue hagiographique hostile au decree de Gelase' in *Analecta Bollandiana,* 82 (1964), pp. 341-53

Deichmann, F.W., *Ravenna, Hauptstadt in der spätantiken Abendlandes* (Wiesbaden, 1976)

Delehaye, H., *Les Origines du Culte des Martyrs* (Brussels, 1912)

Delehaye, H., *The Work of the Bollandists through Three Centuries* (Princeton, 1922)

Delehaye, H., *Sanctus: Essai sur le culte des Saintes dans Antiquité,* Subsidia Hagiographica, no. 17 (Brussels, 1927)

Deliyannis, D., 'A biblical model for serial biography: The Roman *Liber Pontificalis* and the Book of Kings', *Revue Benedictine,* 107 (1997), pp. 15-23

Deliyannis, D.M., *Ravenna in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2010)

Deliyannis, D., 'The Roman *Liber Pontificalis*, Papal Primacy and the Acacian Schism', *Viator* 4(2) (2014**)**, pp. 1-16

Demacopoulos, G.E., 'Gregory the Great and the Sixth-Century Dispute over the Ecumenical Title', *Journal of Theological Studies,* 70 (2009), pp. 600-21

Demacopoulos, G.E., 'Gregory the Great and the Appeal to Petrine Authority', *Studia Patristica,* 48 (2010), pp. 333-46

Demacopoulos, G.E., *The Invention of Peter: Apostolic Discourse and Papal Authority in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 2013)

Demacopoulos, G.E., *Gregory the Great: Ascetic, Pastor, and First Man of Rome* (Notre Dame, 2015)

Dix, G., *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1945)

Doig, A., *Liturgy and Architecture: From the Early Church to the Middle Ages,* Liturgy, Worship and Society (Aldershot, 2008)

Downey, G., 'Justinian the Builder', *Art Bulletin,* 32 (1950), pp. 262-6

Duchesne, L., *Étude sur le Liber Pontificalis*, (Paris, 1877)

Dunn, G.D., 'Innocent I and the Attacks on the Bethlehem Monasteries', *Journal of the Australian Early Medieval Association,* 2 (2006), pp. 69-83

Dunn, G.D., 'Imperial Intervention in the Disputed Roman Episcopal Election of 418/419', *Journal of Religious History,* 39(1) (2015), pp.1-13

Dunn, G.D., 'The emergence of Papal decretals: the evidence of Zosimus of Rome' in G. Greatrex, H, Elton and L. McMahon (eds.), *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2015)

Dunn, G.D., '*Collectio Corbeiensis, Collectio Pithouensis* and the earliest collections of papal letters' in B. Neil and P. Allen (eds.), *Collecting Early Christian Letters: From the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 175-205

Dunn, G.D. (ed.), *The Bishop of Rome in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2015)

Dvornik, F., 'Pope Gelasius and Anastasius I', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift,* 44 (1951), pp. 111-16

Dvornik, F., *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of St Andrew,* Dumbarton Oaks Studies, no. 4 (Cambridge MA, 1958)

Dvornik, F., *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy* (New York, 1996), reprinted from the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, 145 (5) (1961)

Eno, R.B., *The Rise of the Papacy*, Tuohy Lectures, Theology and Life Series, no. 32 (Wilmington 1990)

Ernst, C., 'The Primacy of Peter: Theology and Ideology', *New Blackfriars* 50 (1969), pp. 347-355 and 399-404

Ecribano Paño, M.V., 'Maximus' Letters in the *Collectio Avellana*: A Comparative Study' in R. Lizzi Testa, and G. Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals* (Newcastle, 2019), pp. 50-85

Evers, A., 'East and West, Emperor and Bishop: Hormisdas and the Authority of the See of Rome' in A. Fear, J. Ferdandez Ubiba and M. Marcos (eds.), *The Role of the Bishop in Late Antiquity: Conflict and Compromise* (London, 2013), pp. 167-87

Evers, A., 'The *Collectio Avellana*: An 'Eccentric' Canonical Collection?' in R. Lizzi Testa (ed.), *La* Collectio Avellana *fra Tardoantico e Alto Medioevo, Cristianesimo nella storia*, 39(1) (2018), pp. 71-79

Evers, A., 'The *Collectio Avellana* — collecting with a reason?' in R. Lizzi Testa, and G. Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals* (Newcastle, 2019), pp. 13-28

Ferrari, G., *Early Roman Monasteries: Notes for the History of Monasteries and Convents at Rome from the V through the X century,* Studi di antichità Cristiana, no. 23 (Rome, 1978)

Fioretos, O., T.G. Falleti and A. Sheingate (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (Oxford, 2016)

Flower, R., 'Genealogies of Unbelief: Epiphanius of Salamis and heresiological authority' in M.S. Williams, C. Kelly and R. Flower, (eds.), *Unclassical Traditions Volume II: Perspectives from East and West in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 70-87

Foletti, I. and M. Gianandrea (eds.), *The Fifth Century in Rome: Art, Liturgy, Patronage,* Studia Artium Medievalium Brunensia, no. 4 (Rome, 2017)

Foucault, M., *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-78*, ed. by M. Senellart, F. Ewald and A. Fontana, trans. by G. Burchell; Michael Foucault, Lectures at the Collège de France (London, 2007/2009)

Gantner, C., 'The Lombard Recension of the Roman *Liber Pontificalis*', *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo,* 10(1) 2013, pp. 65-90

Geetman, H., 'Documenti, redattori e la formazione del testo del *Liber Pontificalis'* in Geertman (ed.), *Il Liber Pontificalis e la storia materiale,* Atti del colloquio internazionale, Roma, 21-22 febbraio 2002, *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome,* Assen 60-61 (2003), pp 267-84. Reproduced in *Hic Fecit Basilicam: Studi Sul* Liber Pontificalis *e gli Edifici Ecclesiastici di Roma da Silvestri a Silverio* (Leuven, 2004), pp. 149-67.

Geertman, H., 'Le Biografie del *Liber Pontificalis* del 311 al 535: testo e commentario', in H. Geertman (ed.), *Il Liber Pontificalis e la storia materiale,* Atti del colloquio internazionale, Roma, 21-22 febbraio 2002, *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome,* Assen 60-61 (2003), pp. 285-355. Reproduced in Geertman, *Hic Fecit Basilicam: Studi Sul* Liber Pontificalis *e gli Edifici Ecclesiastici di Roma da Silvestri a Silverio* (Leuven, 2004), pp. 169-235

Geertman, H., 'La genesi del *Liber Pontificalis* romano. Un processo di organizzazione della memoria' in F. Bougard and M. Sot (eds.), *Liber, Gesta, histoire: Écrire l'histoire des évêques et des papes, de l'Antiquité au XXIe siècle* (Turnhout, 2009), pp. 37-107

Gianandrea, M., 'The Artistic Patronage of Popes in the Fifth Century' in I. Foletti and M. Gianandrea (eds.), *The Fifth Century in Rome: Art, Liturgy, Patronage,* Studia Artium Mediaevalium Brunensia, no. 4 (Rome, 2017)

Gibson, R., 'On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections', *Journal of Roman Studies,* 102 (2012), pp. 56-78

Gillet, A., 'Rome, Ravenna, and the Last of the Western Emperors', *Papers of the British School at Rome,* 69 (2001), pp. 131-67

Goodson, C., 'Transforming the city and cult: the relic translations of Paschal I' in A. Hopkins and M. Wyke (eds.), *Roman Bodies: Metamorphoses, mutilation, and martyrdom* (London, 2005), pp. 123-41

Goodson, C., 'Building for Bodies: The Architecture of Saint Veneration in Early Medieval Rome,' in É. Ó Carragáin and C. Neuman de Vegvar (eds.), *Roma Felix: The Formation and Reflections of Medieval Rome,* Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 51–80

Goodson, C., 'Material memory: Rebuilding the Basilica of S. Cecilia in Trastevere, Rome', *Early Medieval Europe,* 15(1) (2007), pp. 20-52

Goodson, C., 'Roman Archaeology in Medieval Rome,' in D. Caldwell and L. Caldwell (eds.), *Rome: Continuing Encounters Between Past and Present* (Aldershot, 2011), pp. 23–45

Goodson, C., 'Archaeology and the Cult of Saints in the Early Middle Ages: Accessing the Sacred', in *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome – Moyen Age,* 126(1) (2014)

Grant, R.M., *Irenaeus of Lyon,* The Early Church Fathers (London, 1997)

Greatrex, G., H. Elton and L. McMahon (eds.), *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity,* (Farnham, 2015)

Green, M.R., 'Supporters of the Anti-Pope Ursinus', *Journal of Theological Studies,* 22(2) (1971), pp. 531-38

Grig, L., *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (London, 2004)

Grig, L. 'Portraits, Pontiffs and the Christianisation of Fourth-Century Rome' *Papers of the British School at Rome,* 72 (2004), pp. 203-30

Grig, L. and G. Kelly (eds), *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity,* Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity (Oxford, 2012)

Grillmeier, A, *Christ in the Christian Tradition: From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604): Reception and Contradiction, The development of the discussion about Chalcedon from 451 to the beginning of the reign of Justinian,* trans. P. Allen and J. Cawte, vol. 2.1 (London/Oxford, 1987)

Grillmeier, A. with T. Hainthaler, *Christ in the Christian Tradition: From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604): The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century,* trans. P. Allen and J. Cawte, vol. 2.2 (London, 1995)

Guidobaldi, F., 'La Fondazione delle basiliche titulori di Roma nel iv e v secolo. Assenze e presenze nel *Liber Pontificalis',* in H. Geertman (ed.), *Il Liber Pontificalis e la storia materiale,* Atti del colloquio internazionale, Roma, 21-22 febbraio 2002, *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te, Rome* 60-61 Assen, 2003), pp. 1-15

Günther, O., *Avellana-Studien,* Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Classe, Bd 134 (Vienna,1896)

Gwynn, D.M., 'Episcopal Leadership' in Scott Fitzgerald Johnson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 876-915

Heather, P., 'The Historical Culture of Ostrogothic Italy' in *Teoderico il Grande e i Goti d'Italia, Atti del XIII congress internazionale di studi sull'alto medioevo Milan 1990* (Spoleto, 1993), pp. 317-53

Hellström, M., 'On the Form and Function of Constantine's Circiform Funerary Basilicas in Rome' in M. Sághy, and R. Lizzi Testa (eds.), *Pagans and Christians in Late Antique Rome: Conflict, Competition and Coexistence in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge, 2016), pp. 291-313

Hertling, L., Communio: *Church and Papacy in Early Christianity,* trans. J. Wicks (Chicago, 1972), originally published as *Communio und Primat,* Miscellanea Historiae Pontificis, no.7, then Una Sancta, no.17 *(*Rome, 1943/1962)

Hillner, J., 'Clerics, property and patronage: the case of the Roman titular churches', *Antiquité Tardive* 14(1) (2006), pp. 59-68

Hillner, J., 'Families, patronage and the titular churches of Rome' in K. Cooper and J. Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 225-61

Hoeflich, M.H., 'Gelasius I and Roman Law: One Further Word' *Journal of Theological Studies,* 26(1) (1975), pp. 114-9

Hodgson, G.M., 'What Are Institutions?', *Journal of Economic Issues,* 40(1) (2006), pp. 1-25

Hodgson, G.M., '"Institution" by Walton H. Hamilton', *Journal of Institutional Economics,* 1(2) (2005), pp. 233-44

Hope, D.M., *The Leonine Sacramentary: A Reassessment of its Nature and Purpose.* Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford, 1971)

Huebner, S.R., 'Currencies of Power: The Venality of Offices in the Later Roman Empire' in A. Cain and N. Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2009), pp. 167-79

Humfress, C., *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2007)

Humfress, C., 'Bishops and Law Courts in Late Antiquity' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* Vol. 19(3) (2011), pp. 375-400

Humphries, M., 'Italy AD 425-600' in A. Cameron, B. Ward-Perkins and M. Whitby (eds.) *Cambridge Ancient History,* Vol. 14: *Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors AD 425-600* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 525-551

Humphries, M., 'From emperor to pope? Ceremonial, space, and authority at Rome from Constantine to Gregory I' in K. Cooper, and J. Hillner (eds), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 21-58

Humphries, M., 'Rufinus' Eusebius: Translation, Continuation and Edition in the Latin *Ecclesiastical History', Journal of Early Christian Studies,* 16(2) (2008), pp. 143-164

Humphries, M., 'Valentinian III and the City of Rome (425-55): Patronage, Politics, Power' in L. Grig and G. Kelly (eds.) *The Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 161-82

Hunt, D., 'The Church as a Public Institution' in A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History,* vol. 13: *The Late Empire AD 337-45* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 238-76

Huskinson, J.M., *Concordia Apostolorum, Christian Propaganda at Rome in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries: A study in Early Christian Iconography and Iconology,* BAR International Series, no. 148 (Oxford, 1982)

Jalland, T.G., *The Church and the Papacy: A Historical Study,* Bampton Lectures at Oxford, 1942 (London, 1944)

James. L., *Mosaics in the Mediterranean World: From Late Antiquity to the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2017)

Jasper, D. and H. Fuhrmann, *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages,* History of Medieval Canon Law (Washington, 2001)

Jeanes, G.P., *The Origins of the Roman Rite* (Grove Books, Nottingham, 1991)

Jeanes, G.P., *The Origins of the Roman Rite,* vol. 2 (Grove Books, Cambridge, 1998)

Jensen, R.M., 'Saints' Relics and the Consecration of Church Buildings in Rome' in J. Day and M. Vincent (eds.), *Studia Patristic,* 71 (2014), Papers Presented at Conferences on *Early Roman Liturgy to 600* (14.11.2009-27.2.2010), pp.153-69.

Johnson, M., 'Towards a history of Theoderic's building programme', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers,* 42 (1988), pp. 73-96

Johnson, M.J., ‘Art and Architecture’ in J.J. Arnold, M.S. Bjornlie and K. Sessa (eds.), *A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 350-89

Jones, A.H.M., ‘Church Finance in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries, *Journal of Theological Studies,* 11(1) (1960), pp. 84-94

Jones, A.H.M., J.R. Martindale and J. Morris (eds.), *The Prosopography of the later Roman Empire,* 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1971-92)

Jones, H., ‘Agnes and Constantia: domesticity and cult patronage in the *Passion of Agnes*’ in K. Cooper and J. Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 115-139.

Jungmann, J.A., The *Early Liturgy: To the time of Gregory the Great*, Liturgical Studies, no. 6 (Notre Dame, 1959)

Jungmann, J.A., *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development* (London, 1959)

Kalas, G., ‘Architecture and Elite Identity in Late Antique Rome: Appropriating the Past at Sant’Andrea Catabarbara’, *Papers of the British School at Rome,* 81 (2013), pp. 279-302

Kelly, C., ‘Later Roman Bureaucracy: going through the files’ in A. Bowman and G. Woolf (eds.), *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 161-76

Kelly, C., ‘Emperors, Government and Bureaucracy’ in A. Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. 13*: *The Late Empire AD 337-45* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 138-183

Kelly, C., *Ruling the Later Roman Empire,* Revealing Antiquity, no. 15 (Cambridge MA, 2004)

Kelly, C., ‘John Lydus and the Eastern Praetorian Prefecture in the Sixth Century AD’, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 98(2) (2005), pp. 431-58

Kelly, J.N.D., in *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th edn. (London, 1977)

Kelly, J.N.D., and M.J. Walsh, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes* 2nd edn. (Oxford, 2010)

Kennedy, V.L., *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass,* Studi di antichità Cristiana, no. 14, 2nd edn. (Rome, 1963)

Kim, Young Richard, ‘The Transformation of Heresiology in the Panarion of Epiphanius of Cyprus’ in G. Greatrex, H. Elton and L. McMahon (eds.), *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2015), pp. 53-68

Kinney, D., ‘Expanding the Christian Footprint’ in I. Foletti and M. Gianandrea (eds.), *The Fifth Century in Rome: Art, Liturgy, Patronage*, Studia Artium Medievalium Brunensia, no. 4 (Rome, 2017), pp. 65-97

Klingshirn, W.E., *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul,* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought Fourth Series, no. 22 (Cambridge, 1994)

Krautheimer, R. *Rome: Profile of a City, 312-1308* (Princeton, 1980/2000)

Krautheimer, R, and S. Ćurčić, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture.* (New Haven, 1965/1986)

Lafferty, S.D.W., 'Law and Society in Ostrogothic Italy: Evidence from the *Edictum Theoderici'*, *Journal of Late Antiquity,* 3(2) (2010), pp. 337-62

Lapidge, M., *The Roman Martyrs: Introduction, Translations and Commentary,* Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford, 2017)

La Rocca, C., 'An Arena of Abuses and Competing Powers' in R. Balzaretti, J. Barrow and P. Skinner (eds.), *Italy and Early Medieval Europe: Papers for Chris Wickham,* The Past and Present Book Series (Oxford, 2018), pp. 201-12

Latham, J. A., 'The Making of a Papal Rome: Gregory I and the *letania septiformis*' in A. Cain and N. Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2009), pp. 293-306

Latham, J. A., 'From Literal to Spiritual Soldiers of Christ: Disputed Episcopal Elections and the Advent of Christian Processions in Late Antique Rome', *Church History,* 81(2) (2012), pp. 298-327

Lenski, N. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* (Cambridge, 2006)

Leyser, C., 'The temptations of cult: Roman martyr piety in the age of Gregory the Great', *Early Medieval Europe* 9(3) (2000), pp. 289-303.

Leyser, C., '"A church in the house of saints": property and power in the *Passion of John and Paul'*, in K. Cooper and J. Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 140-62

Lim, R., *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order,* Transformation of the Classical Heritage, no. 23 (Berkeley, 1995)

Lishitz, F., *The Name of the Saint: the Martyrology of Jerome and Access to the Sacred in Francia, 627-827,* Publications in Medieval Studies (Notre Dame, 2006)

Liverani, P, 'St Peter's and the City of Rome between Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages' in R. McKitterick, J. Osborne, C.M. Richardson and J. Story (eds.), *Old Saint Peter's, Rome* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 21-33

Liverani, P. and G. Spinola, *The Vatican Necropolises: Rome's City of the Dead* (Rome/Turnhout, 2010)

Lizzi Testa, R., 'The Late Antique Bishop: Image and Reality' in P Rousseau (ed.), *A Companion to Late Antiquity* (Chichester, 2012), pp. 525-34

Lizzi Testa, R., 'Clerical Hierarchy and Imperial Legislation in Late Antiquity: Reformed Reformers' in L. Hamilton and G. Bellito (eds.), *Reforming the Church Before Modernity: Patterns, Problems, Approaches* (Farnham, 2013), pp. 87-103

Lizzi Testa, R., 'La *Collectio Avellana* e le collezioni canoniche romane e italiche del V-VI secolo: un Progetto di recerca', *Cristianesimo nella storia,* 35(1) (2014), pp. 77-107

Lizzi Testa, R.(ed.), *La* Collectio Avellana *fra Tardoantico e Alto Medioevo, Cristianesimo nella storia*, 39 (1) (2018)

Lizzi Testa, R., 'Introduction' in R. Lizzi Testa, and G. Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals* (Newcastle, 2019)

Lizzi Testa, R. and G. Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals* (Newcastle, 2019)

Llewellyn, P., *Rome in the Dark Ages* (London, 1971)

Llewellyn, P., 'The Roman Church in the Seventh Century: the legacy of Gregory I', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 25(4) (1974), pp. 363-80

Llewellyn, P., 'The Roman Church during the Laurentian Schism: Priests and Senators', *Church History*, 45(4) (1976), pp. 417-27

Löhr, W., 'Western Christianities' in A. Casiday and F.W. Norris (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, Vol. 2*: Constantine to c. 600* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 9-51

Lo Monaco, F., and F. Mores (eds), *Da vescovi di Roma a Papa l'invenzione del* Liber Pontificalis, *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 10(1) (2013)

Maas, M., *Exegesis and Empire in the Early Byzantine Mediterranean*: *Junillus and the Instituta Regularis Divinae Legis*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum, Bd. 17 (Tübingen, 2003)

Maas, M., *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian* (Cambridge, 2005)

Machado, C., 'Roman aristocrats and the Christianisation of Rome' in P. Brown, and R. Lizzi Testa (eds.), *Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire: The Breaking of a Dialogue (IVth-VIth Century A.D.)*, Proceedings of the International Conference at the Monastery of Bose (October 2008*)* (Zurich, 2011), pp. 517-528

Malinowski, B., *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays* (New York/Oxford, 1944/1960)

Marcos, M., 'Anti-Pelagian Dossiers in Late Antique Canonical Collections' in R. Lizzi Testa and G. Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals* (Newcastle, 2019), pp. 102-122

Marjanen, A., '"Gnosticism"' in S.A. Harvey and D.G. Hunter (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 203-20

Markus, R.A. and E. John, *Papacy and Hierarchy* (London, 1969)

Markus, R.A., 'Papal Primacy: Light from the Early Middle Ages', *The Month*, 229 (1970), pp. 352-61, reprinted in *From Augustine to Gregory the Great: History and Christianity in late Antiquity* (London, 1983), no. 16

Markus, R.A., 'The Legacy of Pelagius: Orthodoxy, heresy, conciliation' in R. Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 214-34

Markus, RA., *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge, 1990)

Markus, R.A., 'Justinian's Ecclesiastical Politics and the Western Church' in *Sacred and Secular: Studies on Augustine and Latin Christianity,* Collected Studies CS 465 (Aldershot, 1994), pt. VII

Markus, R.A., *Gregory the Great and his World* (Cambridge, 1997)

Maskarinec, M., *City of Saints: Rebuilding Rome in the Early Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2018)

Mathisen, R.W., 'Ricimer's church in Rome: how an Arian barbarian prospered in a Nicene World' in A. Cain and N. Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2009), pp. 307-26.

Matthews, J., *Western Aristocracies and the Imperial Court AD 364-425* (Oxford, 1975)

Maxwell, J.L., *Christianisation and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and his congregation in Antioch* (Cambridge, 2006)

Mazzoleni, D., 'The Rise of Christianity' in C. Bruun and J. Edmonson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy* (Oxford, 2015), pp. 445-70

McClanan, A., *Representations of Early Byzantine Empresses: Image and Empire,* The New Middle Ages (New York, 2002)

McCulloh, J.M., 'The Cult of Relics in the Letters and 'Dialogues' of Pope Gregory the Great: A Lexicographical Study', *Traditio,* 32 (1976), pp. 145-84

McCulloh, J.M., 'From Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Continuity and Change in Papal Relic Policy from the sixth to the eighth centuries' in E. Dassmann and K. S. Frank (eds.), *Pietas: Festschrift für Bernhard Kotting* (Munster, 1980), pp. 313-24.

McFarland, I.A., D.A.S Fergusson, K. Kilby, and I.R. Torrance (eds.), *The Cambridge Dictionary of Christian Theology* (Cambridge, 2011)

McGrade, A.S., 'Two Fifth-Century Conceptions of Papal Primacy', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History,* 7 (1970), pp. 1-45

McKitterick, R., *Perceptions of the Past in the Early Middle Ages,* The Conway Lectures in Medieval Studies (Notre Dame, 2006)

McKitterick, R., 'Roman Texts and Roman History in the early Middle Ages' in C. Bolgia. R. McKitterick and J. Osborne (eds.), *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas, c.500-1400* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 19-34.

McKitterick, R., 'Narrative Strategies in the Liber Pontificalis: the case of St Paul, *doctor mundi,* and San Paolo fuori le mura' in F. Lo Monaco and F. Mores (eds.), '*Da vescovi di Roma a Papa l'invenzione del '*Liber Pontificalis', *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo,* 10 (2013), pp. 115-30

McKitterick, R., 'The representation of Old Saint Peter's basilica in the *Liber Pontificalis'* in R. McKitterick, J. Osborne, C.M. Richardson and J. Story (eds.), *Old Saint Peter's, Rome* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 95-118.

McKitterick, R., ‘Transformations of the Roman Past and Roman identity in the early Middle Ages’ in C. Gantner, R. McKitterick and S. Meeder (eds.), *The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 225-44

McKitterick, R., ‘The Papacy and Byzantium in the Seventh- and Early Eight-Century Sections of the *Liber Pontificalis’ Papers of the British School at Rome,* 84 (2016), pp. 241-73.

McKitterick, R., ‘The popes as rulers of Rome in the aftermath of Empire, 476-69’ in S.J. Brown, C. Methuen and A. Spicer (eds.), *The Church and Empire,* Studies in Church History, vol. 54 (Cambridge, 2018), pp. 71-95

McKitterick, R., *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy*: *The* Liber Pontificalis (Cambridge, 2020)

McKitterick, R., R.J. Osborne, C.M. Richardson, and J. Story (eds.), *Old Saint Peter’s, Rome,* British School at Rome Studies (Cambridge, 2013)

McLaughlin, M., *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Cornell, 1994)

McLure, J., ‘Handbooks against Heresy in the West, from the late fourth to the late sixth century’ *Journal of Theological Studies,* NS 30(1) (1979), pp. 186-197

McLynn, N., ‘Crying Wolf’. *Journal of Roman Studies,* 98 (2008), pp 161-175

Menze, V.L., *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church,* Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford, 2008)

Meyendorff. J., ‘Justinian, the Empire and the Church’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers,* 22 (1968), pp. 43-60.

Meyendorff. J., *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church AD 450-680,* Church in History Series, no. 2 (New York, 1989)

Meyer, W., ‘Antioch and the Intersection between Religious Factionalism, Place and Power in Late Antiquity’, in A. Cain and N. Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Aldershot, 2009), pp. 357-67

Meyer, J.W. and B. Rowan, ‘Institutionalised Organisations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony’, *American Journal of Sociology,* 83 (1977), pp. 340-63

Meyvaert, P., ‘A Letter of Pelagius II Composed by Gregory the Great’ in J.C. Cavadini (ed.), *Gregory the Great: A Symposium* (Notre Dame, 1995), pp. 94-116

Moorhead, J. ‘The Laurentian Schism: East and West in the Roman Church’, *Church History,* 47(2) (1978), pp. 125-36

Moorhead, J., *The Popes and the Church of Rome in Late Antiquity,* Routledge Studies in Ancient History, no. 8 (London, 2015)

Moralee, J., *Rome’s Holy Mountain: The Capitoline Hill in Late Antiquity,* Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity (Oxford, 2018)

Moreau, D., '*Ipsis diebus Bonifatius, zelo et dolo ductus:* The Root Causes of the Double Papal Election of 22 September 530' in G.D. Dunn (ed.), *The Bishop of Rome in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2015), pp. 177-96

Moreau, D., 'The Compilation Process of Italian Canonical Collections during Antiquity', in R. Lizzi Testa, and G. Marconi (eds.), *The* Collectio Avellana *and its Revivals* (Newcastle, 2019), pp. 336-69

Neil, B., 'Rufinus' Translation of the *Epistola Clementis ad Iacobum', Augustinianum,* 4(1) (2003), pp. 25-39

Neil, B., *Leo the Great* (Abingdon, 2009)

Neil, B., 'Imperial benefactions to the fifth-century Roman Church' in G. Nathan and L. Garland (eds.), *Basileia: Essays on Imperium and Culture in Honour of E.M. and M.J. Jefferys,* Byzantina Australiensia, no. 17 (Brisbane, 2011), pp. 55-66

Neil, B., 'Crisis and Wealth in Byzantine Italy: The *Libri Pontificales* of Rome and Ravenna', *Byzantion,* 82 (2012), pp. 279-303

Neil, B., 'Crisis in the Letters of Gelasius I (492-96): A New Model of Crisis Management?' in G.D. Dunn (ed.), *The Bishop of Rome in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2015), pp. 155-76

Neil, B., 'Continuities and Changes in the Practice of Letter-collecting from Cicero to Late Antiquity' in B. Neil and P. Allen (eds.), *Collecting Early Christian Letters from the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 3-17

Neil, B., 'Papal Letters and Letter Collections' in C. Sogno, B.K. Storin and E.J. Watts (eds.), *Late Antique Letter Collections,* Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature (Oakland, 2017), pp. 449-66

Neil., B. and P. Allen, *Crisis Management in Late Antiquity (410-590 CE): A Survey of the Evidence from Episcopal Letters* (Leiden, 2013)

Neil, B. and P. Allen (eds.), *The Letters of Gelasius I (492-96)*: *Pastor and Micro-Manager of the Church of Rome* (Turnhout, 2014)

Neil, B. and P. Allen (eds.), *Collecting Early Christian Letters: From the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2015)

Nelson, J.L., 'Gelasius' Doctrine of Responsibility, *Journal of Theological Studies,* 18(1) (1967), pp. 154-62

Nieddu, A.M., 'L'utilizzazione funeraria del suburbio nei secoli V e VI,' in P. Pergola, R. Santangeli, R.S. Valenzani and R. Volpe (eds.), *Suburbium*: *Il suburbio di Roma dalla crisi del Sistema delle ville a Gregorio,* Collection de l'École française de Rome, no. 311 (Rome, 2003), pp. 548-96

Noble, T.F.X., 'A new Look at the *Liber Pontificalis*', *Archivum Historiae Pontificae,* 23 (1985), pp. 347-358

Noble, T.F.X., 'Theoderic and the Papacy' in *Teodorico il Grande e I Goti d'Italia: atti del XIII Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Milan 2-6 novembre 1992,* Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo (1993), pp. 395-423

T.F.X. Noble, 'Michele Maccarrone on the Medieval Papacy: Review Article', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 80(3) (1994), pp. 518-33

Noble, T.F.X., 'The Intellectual Culture of the Early Medieval Papacy' in *Rome nell'alto medioevo,* Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, no. 48 (Spoleto, 2001), pp. 179-219

Nordhagen, P., 'Santa Maria Antiqua: Frescoes of the Seventh Century', *Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia,* 8 (1979), pp. 89-142

Nordhagen, P., 'Constantinople on the Tiber' in J.M.H. Smith (ed.), *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in honour of Donald A. Bullough* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 113-34

North, J.A., 'Caesar at Lupercalia', *Journal of Roman Studies,* 98 (2008), pp. 144-60

Oakeshott, W., *The Mosaics of Rome, from the Third to the Fourteenth Centuries* (London/Greenwich, 1967)

Osborne, J. 'Images of the Mother of God in Early Medieval Rome', in A. Eastmond and L. James (eds.), *Icon and the Word: The Power of Images in Byzantium: Studies Presented to Robin Cormack* (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 135-56

Osborne, J. 'The Cult of Maria Regina in Early Medieval Rome', *Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia*, 21 (2008), pp. 95-106

Osborne, J. and A. Claridge (eds.), *Early Christian and Medieval Antiquities.* The Paper Museum of Cassiano dal Pozzo, Series A: Antiquities and Architecture, 2 vols. (London, 1996-98)

Parker, E.C., 'Architecture as liturgical setting' in T.J. Hefferman and E.A. Matter (eds.), *The Liturgy of the Medieval Church* (Kalamazoo, 2001), pp. 245-94

Parsons, T., 'A sociological approach to the theory of organisations' in T. Parsons, *Structure and Process in Modern Societies* (Glencoe, 1960), pp. 16-58

Pennington, K ., 'The Growth of Church Law' in A. Cassidy and F.W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Constantine to c.600* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 386-402

Peters, B.G., *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The New Institutionalism*, 4th edn. (Cheltenham, 2019)

Pierson, P., *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis* (Princeton, 2004)

Pietri, C., *Roma christiana: recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440),* Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, no. 224 (Rome, 1976)

Pietri, C., ‘Evergétisme et richesses ecclésiastiques dans l’Italie du IVe à la fin du Ve siècle: l’exemple romain’, *Ktema,* 3 (1978), pp. 317-37.

Pietri, C., ‘Donateurs et pieux établissements d’après le légendier roman (Ve-VIIe s.) in *Hagiographie, cultures, sociétes. IVe-XIIe siècles,* Actes du colloque organisé à Nanterre et à Paris (2-5 Mai 1979), (Paris, 1981), pp. 435-53.

Pilsworth, C., ‘Dating the *Gesta Martyrum*: a manuscript-based approach’, in *Early Medieval Europe* Vol. 9(3) (2000), pp. 309-24

Price, R.M., ‘Martyrdom and the Cult of Saints’ in S.A. Harvey and D.G. Hunter (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 808-25

Rapp, C., *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: the Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition,* Transformation of the Classical Heritage, no. 37 (Berkeley, 2005)

Rebillard, É., ‘The Cult of the Dead in Late Antiquity: Towards a New Definition of the Relation between the Living and the Dead’, *Acta ad archaeologiam et atrium historiam pertinentia,* 17(3) (2003), pp. 47-55

Richards, J., *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476-752* (London, 1979)

Richards, J., *Consul of God: The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London, 1980)

Romano, J.F., *Liturgy and Society in Early Medieval Rome* (Aldershot, 2014)

Rose, E., *Ritual Memory: The Apocryphal Acts and Liturgical Commemoration in the Early Medieval West (c.500-1215)* (Leiden, 2005)

Sághy, M., ‘*Scinditur in partes populus*: Pope Damasus and the Martyrs of Rome’, *Early Medieval Europe,* 9 (3) (2000), pp. 273-87

Salway, B., ‘Late Antiquity’ in C. Bruun and J. Edmonson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy* (Oxford, 2015), pp. 364-96

Salzman, M.R., *On Roman Time: The Codex-calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1990)

Salzman, M.R., ‘Book 16 of the Theodosian Code’ *Historia,* 42(3) (1993, pp. 362-78

Salzman, M.R., *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy: Social and Religious Change in the Western Roman Empire* (Cambridge MA, 2002)

Salzman, M.R., ‘Christianity and Paganism, III: Italy’ in A. Cassidy and F.W. Norris (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Constantine to c.600* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 210-230.

Salzman, M.R., ‘Leo in Rome: The evolution of episcopal authority’ in G. Bonamente and R. Lizzi Testa (eds.) *Istituzioni, carismi ed esercizio del potere (IV-VI secolo d.C.)* (Bari, 2010), pp. 343-56

Salzman, M.R., ‘Leo’s Liturgical Topography: Contestations for Space in Fifth-Century Rome’ in *Journal of Roman Studies,* (2013), pp. 1-25

Salzman, M.R., ‘Lay Aristocrats and Ecclesiastical Politics: A new view of the papacy of Felix III (483-492 CE) and the Acacian Schism’, *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 27(1) (2019), pp. 465-89.

Schatz, K., *Papal Primacy from its Origins to the Present* (Collegeville, 1996).

Scott, R.C., *Institutions and Organisations: Ideas, Interests and Identities,* 4th edn. (Los Angeles, 2014)

Searle, J.R., ‘What is an institution?’, *Journal of Institutional Economics,* 1(1) (2005), pp. 1-22

Sessa, K., ‘Exceptionality and Invention: Silvester and the Late Antique “Papacy” at Rome’ in J. Baun, A. Cameron, M. Edwards and M. Vincent (eds.), *Studia Patristica*, 46 (2010), Papers presented at the Fifteenth Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford in 2007, pp. 77-94

Sessa, K., ‘Domestic Conversions: households and bishops in late antique “papal legends”’ in K. Cooper and J. Hillner (eds.), *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 79-114

Sessa, K., *The Formation of Papal Authority in Late Antique Italy* (Cambridge, 2012)

Sessa, K., ‘The Roman Church and its Bishops’ in J.J. Arnold, M.S. Bjornlie and K. Sessa (eds.), *A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 425-50

Siecienski, A.E., *The Papacy and Orthodoxy: Sources and History of a Debate,* Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (Oxford, 2017)

Smith, J.M.H. (ed.), *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in honour of Donald A. Bullough* (Leiden, 2000)

Sogno, C., B.K. Storin and E.J. Watts (eds.), *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide,* Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature (Oakland, 2017)

Sogno, C., B.K. Storin and E.J. Watts, ‘Introduction: Greek and Latin Epistolography and Epistolary Collections in Late Antiquity’ in C. Sogno, B.K. Storin and E.J. Watts (eds.), *Late Antique Letter Collections,* Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature (Oakland, 2017), pp. 1-10

Sot, M., ‘Local and Institutional History (300-1000)’ in Deborah Mauskopf Deliyannis (ed.) *Historiography in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 89-114

Sotinel, C., ‘Pontifical Authority and Imperial Power in the Reign of Justinian: Pope Vigilius’ in C. Sotinel, *Church and Society in Late Antique Italy and Beyond* (Farnham, 2010), I, pp. 1-25. Reproduced from ‘Autorité pontificale et pouvoir impérial en Italie byzantine au temps de Justinien : le pape Vigile’, *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome: Antiquité,* 104 (1992), pp. 439-63

Sotinel, C., ‘Council, Emperor and Bishops: Authority and Orthodoxy in the Three Chapters controversy’ in C. Sotinel, *Church and Society in Late Antique Italy and Beyond*

(Farnham, 2010), V, pp. 1-26**.** Reproduced from 'Le concile, l'empreur, l'évêque: statuts d'autorité dans la querelle des Trois Chapitres' in S. Elm, É. Rebillard and A. Romano (eds.), *Orthodoxie, christianisme, histoire,* Collection de l'École française de Rome, no. 270 (Rome, 2000), pp. 277-99

Sotinel, C., 'Emperors and Popes in the Sixth Century' in M. Mass (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian* (Cambridge 2005), pp. 267-90

Sotinel, C., 'The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy' in C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt (eds.), *The Crisis of* Oikoumene*: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean.* Studies in the Early Middle Ages (Turnhout, 2007).

Sotinel, C., *Church and Society in Late Antique Italy and Beyond,* Collected Studies CS 948 (Farnham, 2010)

Storin, B.K., 'The Letter Collection of Gregory of Nazianzus' in in C. Sogno, B.K. Storin and E.J. Watts (eds.), *Late Antique Letter Collections,* Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature (Oakland, 2017), pp. 81-101

Straw, C., 'Much Ado About Nothing: Gregory the Great's Apology to the Istrians' in C. Chazelle and C Cubitt (eds.), *The Crisis of Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth Century Mediterranean,* Studies in the Early Middle Ages (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 121-60.

Taylor, J., 'The Early papacy at work: Gelasius I (492-96)', *Journal of Religious History,* 8 (1975)**,** pp. 317-32

Thacker, A., 'Memorialising Gregory the Great: the origin and transmission of a papal cult in the seventh and early eighth century', *Early Medieval Europe,* 7(1) (1998), pp. 59-84

Thacker, A., 'In search of Saints: the English Church and the Cult of Roman Apostles and Martyrs in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries' in J.M.H. Smith (ed.), *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in honour of Donald A. Bullough* (Leiden, 2000)**,** pp. 247-77

Thacker, A., 'Rome of the Martyrs: Saints, Cults and Relics, Fourth to Seventh Centuries' in É. Ó Carragáin and C. Neuman de Vegvar (eds.), *Roma Felix: Formations and Reflections of Medieval Rome,* Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 13-50

Thacker, A., 'Martyr Cults Within the Walls: Saints and Relics in the Roman *Tituli* of the Fourth to Seventh Centuries' in A. Minns and J. Roberts (eds.), *Text, Image, Interpretation: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature and its Insular Context in Honour of Éamonn Ó Carragáin* (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 31-72

Thacker, A., 'Patrons of Rome: the cult of Sts Peter and Paul at court and in the city in the fourth and fifth centuries', *Early Medieval Europe,* 20(4) (2012), pp. 380-406

Thacker, A., ‘Popes, emperors and clergy at Old Saint Peter’s from the fourth to the eighth century’ in R. McKitterick, J. Osborne, C.M. Richardson and J. Story (eds.), *Old Saint Peter’s, Rome* (Cambridge, 2013), pp, 137-56

Thomas, E. and C. Witschel, ‘Constructing reconstruction: claim and reality of Roman rebuilding inscriptions from the Latin West’, *Papers of the British School at Rome,* 60 (1992), pp. 135-78

Thunø, E., ‘The cult of the Virgin, Icons and Relics in Early Medieval Rome: a Semiotic Approach and a Sixth Century Proposal’ in *Acta ad archaeologiam et atrium historiam pertinentia,* 17 (2003), pp. 79-98

Thunø, E., *Image and Relic: Mediating the Sacred in Early Medieval Rome,* Analecta Romana Instituti Danici Supplementum 32 (Rome, 2002)

Thunø, E., *The Apse Mosaic in Early Medieval Rome: Time, Network and Repetition* (Cambridge, 2015)

Uhalde, K., ‘Pope Leo I on Power and Failure’ in *The Catholic Historical Review,* 95(4) (2009), pp. 671-88

Ullmann, W., ‘Leo the First and the theme of papal primacy’, *Journal of Theological Studies,* 11(1) (1960), pp. 25-51

Ullmann, W., ‘The significance of the *Epistola Clementis* in the Pseudo-Clementines’, *Journal of Theological Studies,* 11(2) (1960), pp. 295-317

Ullmann, W., *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: A Study in the Ideological Relation of Clerical to Lay Power,* 2nd edn. (London, 1962)

Ullmann, W., *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London, 1972)

Van Dam, R., *Saints and their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul* (Princeton, 1993)

Viezure, D.I., ‘*Collectio Avellana* and the Unspoken Ostrogothic Reconstruction in the Sixth Century’ in G. Greatrex, H, Elton, and L. McMahon (eds.), *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity* (Farnham, 2015), pp. 93-104

Wace, H. and W.C. Piercy (eds.), *A Dictionary of Early Christian Biography and Literature to the End of the Sixth Century A.D. with an Account of the Principal Sects and Heresies* (London, 1911)

Walter, C., *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition* (Abingdon, 2003).

Ward-Perkins, B., *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Urban Public Buildings in Northern and Central Italy AD 300-850* (Oxford, 1984).

Wataghin, G.C., ‘Architecture and Power: Churches in Northern Italy from the 4th to 6th Century’ in W. Bowden, A. Gutteridge, and C. Machado (eds.), *Social and Political Life in Late Antiquity* (Leiden, 2006).

Weisweiller, J., ‘From equality to asymmetry: honorific status, imperial power, and senatorial identity in late-antique Rome’, *Journal of Roman Archaeology,* 25 (2012), pp. 319-50

Westall, R., ‘Theoderic Patron of the Churches of Rome?’, *Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia*, 27 (2014), pp.119-38

Whitby, M., ‘An Unholy Crew? Bishops Behaving Badly at Church Councils’ in R. Price and M. Whitby (eds.), *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400-700* (Liverpool, 2011)

Wickham, C., *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400-800* (Oxford, 2005)

Wickham, L., ‘Pelagianism in the East’ in R. Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 200-13

Wirbelauer, E., *Zwei Päpste in Rom: Der Konflict zwischen Laurentius und Symmachus (498-514): Studien und Texte,* Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt, Bd. 16 (Munich, 1993)

Wirbelauer, E.,‘Reorganiser l‘Eglise Italienne: un étape vers la codification du droit canonique à la fin du Ve siècle et au début du VIe siècle’, *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome – Antiquité,* 125, (2013), pp. 483-85

Wiśniewski, R., *The Beginnings of the Cult of Relics* (Oxford, 2019)

Wolf, G., ‘Icons and Sites: Cult Images of the Virgin in Medieval Rome’, in M. Vassilaki (ed.), *Images of the Mother of God: Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 23-49

Ziegler, A. K., ‘Pole Gelasius I and his teaching on the Relation of Church and State’, *The Catholic Historical Review*, 27(4) (1942), pp. 412-437